

Stanford University Libraries



36105020074493



051
W926 2434
B
11
The World Tomorrow-

A Journal looking toward a Christian World



A MODEST PROPOSAL

**For Preventing the Bolsheviki in Russia from Becoming a
Menace to the Democratic Institutions of All Other Countries**

PRAKTIKOS

THE SUBSTANCE OF SPANISH DISCONTENT

TYLER DENNETT

THE UNIVERSITY IN KHAKI

HERMAN J. MANKIEWICZ

LIQUIDATING SPIRITUAL WAR CONTRACTS

HAROLD A. LARRABEE

THE DANGERS OF HALF DEMOCRACY

HORACE A. EATON



STANFORD LIBRARY

THE SEVEN AGES OF MAN

Illustrated in Four Drawings by ROCKWELL KENT



The World Tomorrow

Contents of the January Number

Retrospect and Prospect.....	1
Views and Reviews.....	2
A Modest Proposal, by "PRAKTIKOS".....	3
The Substance of Spanish Discontent, by TYLER DENNETT.....	9
Statesmanship and Prophecy.....	11
The Seven Ages of Man, by ROCKWELL KENT.....	13
The University in Khaki, by HERMAN J. MANKIEWICZ.....	17
A Book and Some Poems, by GREGORY ZILBOORG.....	19
Liquidating Spiritual War Contracts, by HAROLD A. LARRABEE.....	21
Prisoners and Captives.....	23
Open for Discussion.....	24
The Chopper, a poem, by ERNEST M. HUNT.....	25
The Failure of Half Democracy, by HORACE A. EATON.....	26
Is a New Party Emerging? by N. T. J.....	27
The Legality of the Left Wing Doc- trines, by WALTER NELLES.....	28
The Last Page, by THE PROOF-READER.....	29

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. January, 1920. No. 1.

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., pub-
lishers, 118 East 28th St., New
York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L.
Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer;
John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of *The World To-
morrow*: Norman Thomas, Edi-
tor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Ed-
ward W. Evans, John Haynes
Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, John
Howard Mellish, Ridgely For-
rence, Oswald Garrison Villard,
Harry F. Ward, and Walter G.
Fuller, Associate Editor.

The World Tomorrow is published
on the first of the month, price ten
cents a copy, annual subscription one
dollar. Orders for copies, subscrip-
tions and all correspondence should
be sent to *The World Tomorrow* at
the Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th
Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter
March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of
New York, N. Y., under the Act
of March 3, 1879.

BROOKLYN SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL CULTURE SUNDAY MORNING MEETINGS AT 11

Brooklyn Academy of Music
(Near Atlantic Avenue Subway Station)

Three addresses by Dr. Henry Neumann
on "The Problem of Evil in the Light of To-day's Experience."
Jan. 4—"Is Wells 'Undying Fire' the Answer?"
Jan. 11—"The Illusion and the Ideal of Progress."
Jan. 18—"What Should the Children of the Unorthodox Be
Taught About God and the World's Evil?"
Jan. 25—Oswald G. Villard, Editor, *The Nation*, "Our Press
and the World's Crisis."

Public Invited

Who's Who Among Our Contributors

PRAKTIKOS is a well-known American journalist.
TYLER DENNETT is in charge of the publicity of the Inter-
church World Movement.
HERMAN J. MANKIEWICZ is a graduate of Columbia Uni-
versity, N. Y., and served during the war as a private
in the U. S. Marines. Later he was appointed instructor
in English and journalism in the A. E. F. University at
Bernese.
ROCKWELL KENT is a distinguished American artist.
GREGORY ZILBOORG was secretary to the Minister of Labor
in the Kerensky Government. He is now lecturing and
writing in America.
HAROLD A. LARRABEE, formerly a sergeant in the A. E. F.,
comes from Lochmere, N. H.
ERNEST M. HUNT is a writer whose verse has appeared in
several of our leading magazines.
HORACE A. EATON is professor of English in the University
of Syracuse, N. Y.
WALTER NELLES is attorney for the National Council for
Civil Liberties.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT,
CIRCULATION, ETC., required by the Act of Congress of August
24, 1912, of "The World Tomorrow," published monthly at New
York, N. Y., for October 1, 1919.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and County
aforesaid, personally appeared Norman M. Thomas, who, having
been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the
Editor of "The World Tomorrow," and that the following is, to
the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the
ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the
date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August
24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations,
to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor,
managing editor and business managers are:
Publisher, The Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 E. 28th Street, New
York City; Editor, John Nevin Sayre, Katonah, N. Y.;
Managing Editor, Norman M. Thomas, 118 E. 28th
Street, New York City; Business Manager, none.

2. That the owners are: The Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 E.
28th Street, New York City; John Nevin Sayre, Katonah, N. Y.;
L. Hollingsworth Wood, 20 Nassau Street, New York City; Gilbert
A. Beaver, 118 E. 28th Street, New York City; Harold A. Hesth,
79 Leonard Street, New York City; Norman M. Thomas, 118 E.
28th Street, New York City.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security
holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of
debts, mortgages or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the
owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not
only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear
upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stock-
holder or security holder appears upon the books of the company
as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person
or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also
that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing
affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and
conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do
not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock
and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner;
and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person,
association or corporation has any interest, direct or indirect, in
the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this twenty-ninth day of
September, 1919.

(Seal)

Frederick Pfister.

My commission expires March 30, 1920. Reinstated until 1921.
Note.—This statement corrects an inadvertent omission in the
statement as published in the November issue of "The World
Tomorrow"; it is of October 1st, and changes since that date
will be reported in the April issue.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 1

JANUARY, 1920

10 Cents

Retrospect and Prospect

THE YEAR that has gone will stand out in human memory as the year of disillusionment. From 1914 to 1918 men and women of feeling hearts endured the war and its untold agonies buoyed up by the hope that at last peace would come, and with peace rich blessings to fill the cup of life. There was to be a glad tomorrow for all the world, a new beginning, a great settlement to usher in lasting peace. Britain was to be "a land fit for heroes to live in"—France, her lost provinces restored, was to be freed forever from the menace of invasion, while with Liberty and Democracy for all the world inscribed upon their banners America's legions entered the conflict.

For the fulfillment of these high hopes the common people of the world looked to 1919. And now the year is dying, with every promise unfulfilled. Though humanity numbers its slain by millions and its material losses in billions, there is no optimist among us who is so blind as to think that the "war to end war" achieved its aim, or that democracy, justice and brotherhood have begun their reign in the hearts of men.

But even yet there is still time in which to begin to rebuild a new world. More of us are awake than ever before. In every land, from China to Peru, the lesson is written plain for every man to read, the lesson of the inevitable consequences of imperialism and secret diplomacy, the truth that war cannot cast out war, that peace can be won only by the love that casts out fear.

Of course, it is easier thus to generalize on the failure of the years that have passed, than to make any concrete application of their lessons to the problems of the present, but that very fact challenges us to a real effort—collective as well as individual—for the achievement of human freedom and fellowship. The supreme test of our wisdom and sincerity will come in the field of industry and economics. The workers everywhere are challenging a system of production in which power rests primarily in the hands of absentee owners of land and capital.

Arthur Gleason in a recent review of the English situation puts the matter very plainly:

"To save their country, the owners of land and capital must make a sacrifice comparable to that of volunteer soldiers . . . The change now being wrought out will break into revolution if it is thwarted by the employers and the Government. But if the ruling class yield, the change will be made constitutionally."

This is true also of America, although in this country the crisis may be somewhat more remote. In both countries salvation from bloody internal revolution, or, perchance from imperialistic foreign wars, depends primarily upon the attitude of the middle class—not the aristocracy or the plutocracy—but the great mass of those who have assumed that on the whole their interests are bound up in the continuance of the profit system.

It is hard for many of us to realize how truly the right of men to "unearned income" of one sort or another rests on might, on actual coercion or the threat of it. But in the Year of Disillusionment just gone a new might has arisen to challenge the old, and the imagination of the boldest may well quail at the prospect, if the conflict is fought out on the old lines of force against force.

But another way is possible, and to proclaim this faith is, as we conceive it, the special task of *The World Tomorrow*.

We must seek unremittently the new social order, co-operating in this task even with those with whom we may not wish to co-operate. We must use the weapons of reason and peace in the sacrificial spirit of volunteer soldiers. We must see the real meaning and inestimable worth of the goal we have set before us.

A truly Christian world, a world remade in the spirit of Jesus, cannot be narrowly conceived. It will be a world wherein the white race no longer consciously or unconsciously thinks and acts in terms of white domination, a world in which national wars are unthinkable, a world wherein strife

of classes is no more, because all men are united in the holy tasks of labor and creation.

Such a goal is worth some sacrifice. It can be gained if we learn to think and act generously, rather let us say, *religiously*. Renunciation of individual interests and even of group loyalty for the sake of loyalty to the "Beloved Community," which is all humanity or it is nothing, lies at the very heart of religion. And in religion thus understood the world's salvation is to be found.

The attainment of that salvation may be more immediate than in our discouragement we have dared to think. It is indeed almost 2000 years since One came who was sent "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." Still we wait for its coming, and our hearts cry out, "How long, O Lord, how long?" But the fault is man's not God's. The acceptable year of the Lord is still at hand whenever men will bring glad tidings to the poor, proclaim release to captives, recovering of sight to the blind, and set at liberty those that are bruised.

Views and Reviews

America 1620—1920

THE deportation craze still rages. The Administration has so little real trust in democracy that it would rather ship the "reds" to Russia—where some people complain there is already an over supply—than let them discuss their opinions here. The Department of Justice has brought new indictments, under the war time Espionage Law, against the editors of Seattle's powerful labor daily, *The Union Record*. Congress is planning new coercive legislation which President Wilson endorsed in the same message in which he said that "Repression is the seed of revolution." Postmaster General Burleson has again autocratically denied the New York *Call* second class mailing privileges. By its actions the American Legion seems determined to become a 20th century Klu Klux Klan. In western Pennsylvania freedom of speech and assembly lie at the mercy of the state Cossacks, or Police as they are sometimes called.

Yet none of these things seem to our mind so clear a proof of the breakdown of our so-called democracy as the decision of the Supreme Court (with only two dissenting votes) upholding the sentence of Mollie Steimer, Jacob Abrams and their co-defendants to *fifteen and twenty years in prison* for the crime of passing out handbills protesting in somewhat reckless language against intervention in Russia. We doubt if any sentence under the Czar's regime was ever more cruel, more inspired by ignorance and fear than this act of Judge Clayton's which is now confirmed by our highest court.

The fate of these youths—they are indeed scarcely older than children—makes the long delayed amnesty for all political prisoners even more urgent than before.

Perhaps Lincoln Was Right

JUSTICE Holmes' dissenting opinion in the Abrams case, concurred in by Justice Brandeis, is a most conspicuous evidence that not all American judges have been swept by hysteria. Two quotations show Mr. Holmes' sense of justice and understanding of the true basis of democracy.

"In their conviction upon this indictment the de-

fendants suffered a great wrong. . . . In this case sentences of twenty years' imprisonment have been imposed for the publishing of two leaflets that I believe the defendants had as much right to publish as the Government has to publish the Constitution of the United States, now vainly invoked by them."

"When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution."

Fortunately Justice Holmes is not a solitary evidence of a return to reason. A few newspapers, notably the New York *World*, are beginning to speak vigorously for a rational conception of civil liberty. Some of our cities, notably Detroit, have lately shown a broad understanding of the meaning of free assemblage. Even some American Legionaries are beginning to realize that it is not necessary to break up Fritz Kreisler's concerts to prove 100 per cent. loyalty. Perhaps Lincoln was right, "You can't fool all the people all the time."

The Optimism of Ignorance

WHEN things are wrong it pays to know it. Pollyanna is not the best guide for a society determined to set its affairs in order. Progress has few worse enemies than ignorant optimism. The first step in fighting evil, from hook worm disease to child labor, lynch law or militarism, is to know the facts, however unpleasant they may be.—Which reflections are inspired by the information that the newspaper reports in which we rejoiced last month are incorrect in stating that child labor has been cut 40% in this country during the past year. The federal law, we learn, applies to no such high percentage of children in gainful employment. These children, Americans all, are still awaiting their release. Here is a field, ripe for harvest, for our "Americanization" friends to work in.

The Mines for the Nation

INJUNCTIONS are no longer in repute as coal diggers. Even our conservative papers grow caustic when they consider the Administration's method of handling the coal dispute. This is to the good; but it is not enough that the general public should dismiss the matter from its mind with any such elemental conclusions, and go on about its business with a sigh of relief that for the present at any rate disaster has been averted. To avoid the recurrence of trouble we must all do some real hard thinking.

For instance it may be true, as Dr. Garfield says, that a 14% increase will bring miners' wages up to the purchasing power of their pre-war wages, and that under the profit system to add more than 14% to wages would increase the price of coal to the consumer. But it does not follow that the 1914 wage level was adequate. If it was not, the men who do the difficult and dangerous work of digging coal deserve a larger reward, even at the expense of the long suffering consumer. Neither does it follow from Dr. Garfield's statement that it is fair to increase all wages by a flat percentage, whether it be the President's 14% or the 60% originally demanded by the miners. It may be that the lowest paid man ought to have a larger per cent of increase than the highest paid. Yet both miners and operators have insisted that the coal commission preserve the same proportionate rates of payment, or "differential," as at present.

Both the strike and the revelations of the mine owners' profits have combined to open the eyes of thinking people to the necessity of putting an end to the private ownership of mines which their owners did not create and do not even manage efficiently. The slogan for consumers as well as miners is "Nationalize the coal mines." After that comes the institution of democratic and efficient management.

Railroading the Railroad Bill

A STRONG effort is being made in and upon Congress to hasten the return of the railroads to the stockholders. The Plumb Plan League charges that to this end an unfair representation of the real condition of the railroad finances is being made. Surely it is plain horse-sense that pending the education of the public and the adoption of a permanent policy, it is better that the railroads should remain under Government operation than that they be returned to private control either with or without large subsidies from the State. The present system of operating the railroads is open to much criticism but it is avowedly temporary and much to be preferred to the hasty adoption of such a permanent policy as is embodied in the Cummins or Esch bills which Congress is now considering. In urging their point, organized labor and representatives of the farmers' organization have rendered President and Congress good service.*

* The Senate has since passed the Cummins Bill and the President has set a date for the return of the roads. We may hope however that the anti-strike clause of the Cummins Bill and the excessive guarantee to the stockholders may be defeated.

Victorious Russia

THE western nations are still starving Russia but the end draws near. Daily the Soviet armies win new victories; daily the forces which clamor for an end of the blockade grow stronger in the territories of her enemies. Staunch anti-Bolshevik editors are confessing that the game is up. Both in London and Washington powerful manufacturing interests demand a chance to trade with the only Russian government which has anything to offer them—Lenin's! It is all very well to fight "Bolshevism" at home but it's a pity to lose a chance to do profitable business with peacefully inclined Bolsheviki thousands of miles away. So labor has powerful company in its demand for peace with Russia. But the churches are still silent, and by their silence they crucify Christ afresh.

The Terrible Bolsheviki!

"There was no sense in fighting the Russians, who were treating us damn white and only beggin' us to clear out and let them settle their own pudding."

"I guess the lieutenants and captains thought the same way about it, although outwardly they kept up the bluff of the Bols being worse than the Germans. We thought so too at first, and, say, the atrocities we committed against them were worse than any German atrocities against the Australians and Canadians. Yes, we killed Bolsheviki prisoners, we tortured them, we bayoneted, wounded and left them to freeze to death. After they replied by sending our wounded back well cared for we changed our tactics. We couldn't believe our officers then."

THIS is from George Seldes' account in a recent issue of the Chicago *Tribune* of his interview with British soldiers, lately returned from North Russia. It looks to us as if the terrible Bolsheviki were using a weapon not recognized in international law,—they actually appear to be trying out the ridiculous plan of overcoming evil with good—and it seems to work!

The Conscientious Objector in Russia and America

SO much is said of the tyranny of Bolshevism that its decree on conscientious objectors to military service is worth printing in full:

1. Persons who are prevented by their religious convictions from taking part in military service shall, on the finding of a national tribunal, perform instead some other service for their comrades, viz., medico-sanitary service—principally in hospitals for infectious diseases—or any other service of public utility at the option of the said persons.

2. In giving its judgment for substituting civil work for military service, the national tribunal shall obtain the expert evidence of the "United Council of Moscow Religious Groups and Communities" concerning each person separately. The expert evidence must show whether such and such religious conviction excludes the participation in military service, as well as bear witness to the sincerity and honesty of the person to be exempted.

3. In exceptional cases the above-mentioned United Council may enter a claim at the All-Russian

Central Executive Committee for the total exemption of a person, without the substitution of any other service whatsoever, if able to prove by written documents on the question, and by the life hitherto led by the said person, that such a substitution would be incompatible with his religious convictions.

Supplementary.—Exemption may be claimed either by the person concerned or by the said United Council, which also may claim that the case be dealt with by the National Tribunal at Moscow.

(Signed) Lenin,
President of the Council of People's Commissaries.
Kursky,
People's Commissary for Justice.

We are such uncompromising opponents of conscription that we cannot heartily approve of this document, but it is a decided advance on the theory and on the practice of our own government. Americans are in danger of forgetting that over one hundred conscientious objectors are still imprisoned in our American military prisons. Not only has Secretary of War Baker deliberately countenanced the continued imprisonment of objectors in order to maintain the morale of his military machine, but he has permitted an additional astounding injustice. On the authority of Clark Getts and other former prisoners in Alcatraz it appears that, although the practice of imprisoning absolutist objectors in dungeons has been discontinued, such objectors have actually been sentenced by General Court Martial to additional terms of imprisonment for what is in its essence the original offense, namely, the refusal to obey military orders. There is no assurance that this process cannot continue indefinitely until death itself brings release. Would it not be well for those who cry out against the coercion of Bolshevism to give themselves to the effort to remove the beam from our own eye so that we may see clearly to remove the mote from our brother's eye?

The Real Peacemakers

ALREADY more than two thousand girls and boys from Vienna have been received into Italian homes and thus saved from death by starvation. When one remembers the stories of the bitterness of Italian hate of her Austrian foe this is a remarkable testimony both to the tragic plight of once proud Vienna and to a new birth of pity in Italian hearts. Europe's best hope lies in the spread of that feeling. Everywhere the administrators, the politicians and the soldiers have failed. "The peace cannot live without force," a great French paper has declared. It is therefore no peace. Political grievances and nationalistic hates rage and burn in Central Europe, the Balkans and the Near East, despite the economic exhaustion of all the peoples. Despair rules and knows no frontiers. But if with hearts kindled with pity men forget vengeance and hatred, then not D'Annunzio but the nameless Italian parents who have found homes for the children of their former enemies are the standard bearers of the new Italy—yes and of the new Europe, and show the only way to avoid complete disaster. America's economic help is imperative and should be extended on the simple basis of human need.

Light Breaking Through

IN ANY review of the year 1919 acknowledgment would have to be made of the fact that all over the world there are springing up organizations of men and women, especially of young men and women, who protest against some form of organized cruelty and oppression, and insist there is an idealism possible which shall be neither hypocritical nor sentimental. Our information is too fragmentary to permit us even to begin to catalog all these new groups. In France the distinction of Henri Barbusse and other French writers who support the newly formed radical society "*Clarté*" has already made it famous. This group champions the cause of the workers and opposes nationalistic and imperialistic wars.

A similar spirit is stirring in England. All observers agree that the British Universities are awakening to the vision of a new social order. Recently a conference for the promotion of a league of religions was held in London in which Buddhists and Mohammedans, were represented as well as Jews and Christians. It was concerned apparently more with the establishment of international peace than with economic problems, but its aims show a real desire to make all religions minister to the growth of understanding and good-will. In London also there was held in September an international conference on labor and religion. It was frankly representative of the right and center of the labor movement in England and on the Continent. Its proceedings showed a real appreciation of the essentially religious quality of many of labor's demands.

Planning the Christian Revolution

OF MORE personal interest to our readers was the recent gathering at Bilkhoven, in Holland, called by the English Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Dutch Brotherhood in Christ. Fifty-four men and women were present representing ten nations, including Germany, Austria and Hungary. The American Fellowship of Reconciliation was represented by five delegates who have brought back enthusiastic reports of the spirit of the gathering. The keynote of the movement may be found in these sentences taken from a published statement:

"Acknowledging each his own share in the sins of his own country in connection with the war and the making of so-called peace, and in deep shame for their part in the failure of their respective Churches to maintain a universal spirit during war, they [the delegates at Bilkhoven] agreed that the time had come to work for a Christian International.

"Those who enter such a movement place the claims of Christ and humanity above those of any State, while none the less serving their own nation in every possible way. They cannot therefore kill their fellow-men on any pretext whatever, or take any part in military service. They are utterly opposed to Capitalism and Imperialism. The cause of the oppressed is their cause. They are determined on a Revolution so radical that if sought through violence it would surely fail. They are pledged to a life service for the whole human family."

A Modest Proposal

For Preventing the Bolsheviki in Russia from Becoming a Menace to the Democratic Institutions of All Other Countries

By PRAKTIKOS

IT is a melancholy fact, evident enough to any reader of the public prints, that civilization has but just now gained release from one deadly menace only to be confronted by a new and more frightful threat against its corporate existence. One might say, in homely phrase, that mankind has but painfully struggled out of the frying-pan into the fire. Yesterday the Boche, today the Bolshevik; and of these two it is the latter who wears the more horrific aspect, the more blood-congealing front. Out of mighty Russia, for long centuries the exemplar of quiet and effective government, has suddenly burst the red dawn of a doctrine that strikes terror to the heart of all governments—the doctrine that only those who work shall rule. Its millions of peasants, toiling through generation after generation in such virtuous docility for the aristocrats whose lands they were permitted to cultivate, have as by some evil incantation been suddenly transformed into a vast mob of fanatics, wildly pulling down the holy temples of Czardom and enunciating insane demands for political and economic liberty, for a world-fraternity of workers, for equality based on the willingness of the individual to work for what he gets.

Every person whom our journalists characterize as right-thinking will instinctively realize that such vile and abhorrent tenets, subversive as they are of all that has hitherto been held sacred by the ruling classes in every land, must be resisted to the death by organized governments everywhere. Were the workers of Russia to succeed in founding a durable government on these detestable principles, what government anywhere would be safe from the insidious contagion of such an example? What journalists call the right sort of public opinion is universally agreed that the loathsome and criminal doctrine of Bolshevism must be exterminated at whatever cost. And as it happens, rather unfortunately, that ideas cannot themselves be shot or starved or indeed put down in any manner save by the conquering force of more persuasive ideas, it is wholly natural that the governments of the world, true to their immemorial tradi-

tions, should unite in the simple expedient of shooting and starving those who hold these pernicious ideas.

So it is that for more than a year past all the great democratic governments outside of Russia have put forth the most nobly heroic and sacrificial efforts to rid the earth of the Bolshevik curse by ridding the earth of Bolsheviki, men, women, and children alike. At tremendous detriment to their own trade, they have maintained a stringent blockade of the Russian frontiers and coasts, so that no means of subsistence for life or industry might pass into Russia. Themselves well-nigh bankrupt after a long and ruinous war, they have generously contributed enormous sums of money and vast supplies of munitions to the monarchist and Cossack bands harassing the Bolsheviki inside of Russia. At a time when their soldiers were often needed to suppress insurrections and disorders within their own domains, they have chivalrously maintained large armies on Russian soil, for co-operation with the enemies of the revolution. At great risk to many of their own imperial ambitions, they have fostered all sorts of temporary imperialisms inside and out the Russian border country, in an effort to encircle the republic with a *cordon sanitaire* of safe and sane governments. At huge expense and pains they have maintained a strict censorship of all news passing in or out of Russia, and have carried on an elaborate system of anti-Bolshevik propaganda throughout the world. And as a final and overwhelming proof of their devotion to the interests of humanity, they have so far humbled their pride as publicly to invite their late enemy, the detested Boche, to become their ally in this new holy war.

But the lamentable truth must be recorded that all this munificent expenditure, this super-heroic endeavor, this illimitable sacrifice and abnegation, this supreme moral self-abasement, has amounted to precisely nothing in bringing nearer the object sought. Indeed, it has rather made that object more distant by rallying all the conflicting non-monarchist factions of Russia to the standard of the Bolsheviki, and provoking the resentment in every country of that

depraved but numerous class known as radicals and apologists for radicals. After two years of incessant struggle, weakened by privation and fatigue, hampered at every turn by deficient transport and lack of supplies, destitute of food, clothing, fuel, medicines, antiseptics, anaesthetics, of all that makes life human and tolerable, —these fanatic hordes of Russia still grimly hold their long frontiers against the world, still doggedly throw back the allied and counter-revolutionary forces on a dozen fronts, still grow in numbers and endurance and resourcefulness as their difficulties multiply.

It must now be sufficiently plain to the better sort of public opinion that if civilization is to be rescued from the doom that threatens it, some wholly new method of attack must be launched against these obdurate monsters. They have so far proved themselves immune to every weapon that the highest allied and associated intelligence has been able to devise—blockade, tanks, poison gas, propaganda, political intrigue, and what not. Obviously, therefore, some more drastic expedient must be resorted to. It is the purpose of the present writer to suggest such an expedient.

But before I go further, it seems desirable to say a preliminary word to those sentimentalists who are likely to censure my proposal on the score of what they will term its inhumanity. To be sure, I do not look for such censure from any but a certain group, insignificant in size and despicable in character, made up almost wholly of pacifists and pro-Germans—the same persons, in fact, who alone protested against the so-called inhumanity of the recent allied blockade of the Central Powers. But I hope to prove to the satisfaction of even such moral perverts as these that my plan is very far from inhumane; that indeed, if pity and compassion were not now so universally identified with the mollicoddle character, I might very successfully defend my proposal on the sole ground of its humanity. In brief, for the lingering and uncertain means of producing death by starvation, commonly reputed the most agonizing to which the human body can be subjected, I propose to substitute a quick and certain and less painful means. If the former method is almost universally accepted and endorsed by the highest ecclesiastical opinion outside of Russia and Germany as a necessary means to a desirable end, surely there can be no word of just objection to the latter; and unless it can be proved that it is more humane to subject a person to months rather than to

hours of torture, I shall hope to hear no more of this cant about inhumanity, even from that class of lily-livered invertebrates mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph.

SCIENCE TO THE RESCUE OF CIVILIZATION

Now at last, to come to the heart of my proposal, let me say that I would substitute for the present costly and uncertain method of national massacre by starvation the far more scientific, efficient, and economical plan of national massacre by pathogenic bacteria. More specifically, I propose that a sufficient number of artificial "cultures" of the *Spirillum cholerae asiaticae*, or Asiatic cholera bacterium, be simultaneously introduced into the water-supply of all the chief cities of Soviet Russia, such introduction to be made by aviators or secret agents or by any other means that the allied and associated military authorities may decide upon. A very little investigation into etiology will show that of the various bacteria available for this purpose the *Spirillum cholerae asiaticae* is by far the most desirable. It is probably the most virulent and infectious of any of the bacteria of which we have definite scientific data, and it can be most easily introduced into a large community. The disease which it produces has always been endemic to Russia—the great plague of 1892-5 alone claimed some 300,000 victims in the Russian Empire. But the conditions in Russia today, mainly due to the blockade, might be characterized as almost ideally favorable to the introduction of Asiatic cholera. This disease always attacks by way of the stomach and intestines, and in a weakened condition particularly these organs provide an ideal breeding-ground for its bacilli. Insufficient nourishment is among the two or three known predisposing causes of the disease, while it has been proved that such ancillary conditions as fatigue, depressed vitality, exposure to cold, etc., immensely increase the efficiency of the bacterial infection. Finally should be mentioned the almost complete lack of medicines, antiseptics, and hygienic supplies in Russia, due also to the blockade. Noting all these favorable circumstances, one might well say that instead of being an expensive failure, as some faint-hearted grumblers have termed the blockade, it may in truth prove a benign instrument of providence in so thoroughly preparing the path for our great adventure.

Of the methods to be adopted for systematically and effectively introducing the *Spirillum cholerae asiaticae* into Soviet Russia, I shall say

nothing here. The perfection of those methods will be a simple problem for the eminently practical minds in governmental circles. But I should like to emphasize the importance of some great public religious ceremony, to be performed in connection with the project. Such a ceremony would be of immense value in removing any possible qualms on the part of thin-skinned persons as to the ethics of the enterprise, by lending it the high sanction of the Church, here as always devotedly associating itself with practical statesmanship. This ceremony might take the form of a public blessing of the "cultures" by duly appointed churchmen in each of the allied and associated capitals, as heretofore swords and cannon have been officially blessed by the Church before going into action; the various "culture" bearers to depart immediately upon their mission at the conclusion of the rites. But this suggestion is merely by the way, and would no doubt occur to the religious and secular authorities without prompting from me.

The practical, and therefore the pivotal, point is that the *Spirillum cholerae asiaticae* be introduced throughout Soviet Russia as nearly simultaneously as possible in all the large public centres. If the thing is efficiently planned, as it certainly will be, the entire country should be one vast pest-house within a week. So perfect are the existing conditions of starvation, fatigue, hygienic disorganization, lack of clothes, fuel, medical supplies, etc., due to the blockade, that within a month the great majority of the population would be extinct. Within six months it would probably be quite safe for the allied and associated governments to enter the country, destroy all existing traces of human habitation, re-purify the water supply, and comfortably dispose of the lands, forests, mines, etc., among themselves on some pre-arranged plan by which each would share in proportion to his contribution in the crusade. The world would at last have been made safe from Bolshevism, and its saviours would have their appropriate and merited reward.

THE DIFFICULTIES ARE NOT INSUPERABLE

I am not so vain of my conception as to contend that it is devoid of serious difficulties, even grave dangers. But I do contend that such difficulties and dangers as it involves are precisely those that are also inherent in the present course of the allied and associated governments. Someone will say, for instance, that in our purification of Russia by pathogenic bacteria it will

be impossible so to manage matters that the *Spirillum cholerae asiaticae* will properly distinguish between peasant and aristocrat, between Bolshevik and anti-Bolshevik, attacking the former and avoiding the latter in each case, but that all will be attacked indiscriminately. True—and this is precisely the effect of the present blockade; all classes and all parties are indiscriminately subjected to the same privation, are put to the same lingering death. Another will point out that in infecting the Russian people with Asiatic cholera we run the risk of infecting the world outside of Russia also. Granted—but the present policy is just as surely infecting the world with the contagion of working-class revolution, which (as any well-to-do person will testify) is infinitely more to be dreaded than an actual physical plague, against which the well-to-do can fortify themselves with comparative ease and security. Still another objector will say that the vitally important matter of Russia's foreign debt, particularly the French bonds inherited from the Romanoff regime, is not satisfactorily arranged for in my proposal. It will be said, and with some truth, that just as dead men tell no tales, so do they pay no bills. But are they any the more likely to pay after death from starvation than death by cholera? Indeed, next to the sentimentalists, it is precisely the allied and associated financiers who should most enthusiastically support my plan, because it promises to reward them within a certain brief and definite period with many thousand-fold the amount of their present accounts due for support of the Czarist government. Instead of an insignificant hereditary claim on the future toil of Russian peasants, it gives them at one stroke the whole of Russia itself—minus the refractory peasants.

Such then, in broadest outline, is my argument. As a practical man in a practical world, I have tried to indicate what seems to me the most desirable, the most effective, the most remunerative, and (as a concession to the mollycoddle minority, let me add) the most humane method of settling the Russian problem and finally annihilating that Red Devil whose sinister shadow darkens every parliamentary hall, every chamber of commerce, every palace and clubhouse, throughout the world. Should the allied and associated governments now refuse, perhaps through some weak and inconsistent compunction, to adopt the proposal here advanced, I know of but a single alternative. They must make peace with the Russian leaders, raise

the blockade, and leave the Russian people free to live under what government they will. This involves, as a necessary corollary, that to prevent the spread of the lying doctrine of Bolshevism they must put in the field against it the true doctrine of Democracy, in pursuance of Milton's formula: "Let Truth and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse

in a free and open encounter?" But I much fear that Milton's optimism concerning the superior strength of Truth is an out-worn faith; at any rate, I have yet to hear of a practical statesman in the allied and associated world to-day who is willing to risk the results of a free and open encounter between the truth of Democracy and the falsehood of Bolshevism.

Some Questions for Irish Protestants

To the Ulster Delegation now in this country, representing the Irish Protestant Churches, and to those Americans inclined to think of the Irish problem in religious terms, we should like to put certain questions. Is self-determination to be denied to a people on the basis of our approval or disapproval of their religion? Ought the fate of Ireland to be controlled by a Unionist minority—opposed alike to Sinn Fein and Home Rule—consisting as shown in the last election of only one-fifth of the voting population? Has a minority the right to demand of the majority anything more than proportionate representation and adequate protection of civil and religious liberties? Does not experience show where there is political freedom, clericalism and bigotry no longer flourish?

It behoves us who are Protestants to refer to Irish history with penitence and humility. Protestantism in Ireland was established by the sword, and was maintained, even into the Victorian era, by the coercion of a Catholic majority by a bitter and prejudiced Protestant minority. To this day Ulster Protestants have been the backbone of the opposition to liberal legislation in the British Parliament. Whatever the sins of the Catholic Church, Catholic Ireland opened her gates to French Huguenots and English Quakers, and so little has Irish nationalism been exclusively a religious question that fully half of her greatest leaders have been Protestants, and Protestants are high in the councils of Sinn Fein and in the membership of the Irish parliament.

On the other hand the Catholic hierarchy at times has proved a useful servant to the Protestant government of England. Good Orangemen should gratefully remember that the Pope was the ally of William of Orange against the French and celebrated a *Te Deum* in the Vatican after William's famous victory on the Boyne. In more modern times the Catholic hierarchy opposed the Irish Land League in the interest of English landlords. And it was the Catholics of Ireland who rebuked the Vatican's attempt to defeat the raising of a fund for the Protestant Parnell. "Peter's Pence" were scantily given until "Parnell's Pounds" were raised. It is worth while to record these facts of history because they are too often forgotten, or left unsaid, by some of our Ulster friends. For our part we see no reason to distrust the Sinn Fein pledge of religious toleration and equality. Surely our Ulster friends will not ask their co-religionists to believe

that Protestantism in Ireland can flourish only under the protection of a strong Protestant state.

While the delegation from Ulster was crossing the Atlantic the London *Nation* was publishing Mr. H. N. Brailsford's account of conditions "In Occupied Ireland." We hope our distinguished visitors will not fail to read this striking article by a trustworthy, and we believe Protestant, English witness. Says Mr. Brailsford:

"In spite of the legal suppression of Sinn Fein and the Gaelic League, the Irish Parliament, 'Dail Eireann' has at its back a practically unanimous people. In broad daylight you may see the prospectus of its loan placarded across the recruiting posters in Sackville Street, though scores of newspapers have been suppressed for publishing it. To possess this prospectus may mean two years' imprisonment, and yet in every village you may learn how much this farmer or the other has contributed."

Arbitration courts set up in the name of the Republic though proscribed by the British Government have an authority which King George's magistrates lack. It is a delusion to refer to Sinn Fein as a party of extremists, "its spirit is sober and practical. It detests rhetoric. . . . So sure is it of itself and of its hold upon the people, that it can afford to be tolerant." No section of Irish thought is really interested in any scheme for a divided Ireland. Mr. Brailsford's remarkable conclusion is:

"We may be far from the dawn of any red day for our own Empire. It may be that we can continue for years, even for decades, to gild repression with insincere tentatives of conciliation. Years and decades are but moments in the life of a nation that consciously grows stronger, and hardens its bones within our fetters. It does not tire. It is schooled to sustain the posture of the immobile wrestler. We achieve for all our pains only waste, futility, and frustration, and what we waste is, above all, our own good name."

We urge consideration of such disinterested testimony as Mr. Brailsford's upon those Americans who are not unnaturally impatient at the bellicose talk of certain Irish-American politicians.*

* Through carelessness in proof reading it was made to appear that the summary of acts of coercion in Ireland published in our last issue began with May 1, 1918, instead of May 1, 1916. We much regret the error. The latest news from Ireland tells of 3,187 fresh acts of coercion, such as we listed in these pages last month, all committed within the last six weeks.

The Substance of Spanish Discontent

By TYLER DENNETT

Fragmentary dispatches in our newspapers telling of prolonged political crisis in Spain and continuous industrial trouble of the most serious kind centering around Barcelona give special timeliness to this informing article.

AN OLD FABLE current among the poorer Spanish people gives one the key to understanding most of Spain's troubles. I give the story as I heard it in Alicante down on the Mediterranean coast. At the time of creation it is said that Saint James, the Spanish patron saint, went to Christ to ask for certain special favors for his country. He asked for sunny skies, fruits and flowers and pretty women. These were granted and Saint James retired, for the moment satisfied. But after further consideration he concluded that he had not asked for enough so he returned and demanded a further grant—good government. But meanwhile the other saints had been putting in their requests and Saint James was told that his country had already received its share of divine favors. The Spanish people tell this story and then laugh. But more recently this laughter has been replaced by serious thought. Why, they are now asking, is it necessary for Spain to have bad government?

The Regionalist question in Spanish politics is an illustration of the new attitude of Spain on the subject of efficient government. The Regionalists are for self-determination. There are several movements but the principal one is in Catalonia, the five northeast provinces of which Barcelona is the industrial center.

Catalonia, the Ulster of Spain, the richest part of the country and the industrial center of the nation, remembered, under the inspiration of the doctrine of self-determination, that Catalonia was once independent. In those days of the dim past Catalonia also included a part of Southern France. Marshall Joffre is a Catalonian, and one of the most popular postcards sold in Barcelona shows a picture of Marshall Joffre with an inscription in Catalonian language in which he calls himself "a Catalan of France." The Catalans are very sensitive on this matter of language. They tell you that they inherited it directly from the Roman Empire and that all other filiations of the Latin tongue are greatly corrupted.

Catalonia has more at stake in the regionalist movement than the preservation of her culture. There is an old grudge against the Castilian government. Spain discovered the new world in the western hemisphere but for centuries the Catalans

were excluded by trade regulations from reaping their share of the harvest. Madrid used to discriminate against Catalonia. The Catalans claim that the practice persists. Barcelona is more progressive than other parts of Spain. She has learned how to operate factories, make automobiles, and even build ships. She does not understand why, in view of her proved superior efficiency, it is necessary to send all her tax money to Madrid for distribution, or why she should be taxed to build roads in Andalusia, or why, when she wants a bridge at home, she has to ask Madrid for the permission and the money with which to build it.

Catalonia is frankly in despair of good government for all of Spain. She therefore wishes autonomy, fiscal at least and perhaps political, merely to save what she can out of the wreck. Relying on the facts that Catalonia was always the most properly part of Spain, that it sent 30,000 volunteers to fight for the Allies in France, and banking on the principle of self-determination, the Catalans sent a petition to President Wilson when he reached Paris in January, pleading that the Peace Conference take a hand in the autonomy question. There was no reply to the petition.

When the egg-shell of Spanish government is once cracked, as will happen some day, either by revolution or by thorough constitutional reforms, the Regionalists will play a very important part in the new construction.

One evening I was taken to a certain place where I could meet some of those liberal-minded gentlemen who were charged with bringing on all the recent industrial trouble in Barcelona. I was introduced to young men under thirty years of age who spend their evenings in the Escola Elemental del Treball, the elementary trade school recently started by the city. They were quiet-spoken, neatly dressed, and very, very earnest. They called themselves syndicalists, all except one, the meekest of them all. He was a communist anarchist. They defended the strike, and defended the methods employed. They denied the assassinations. Some of them had just been released from jail where they had been treated not only brutally but with disgusting bestiality. No, not one of them ever went to a bull-fight. Bull-fights were to them disgusting affairs. They would rather spend their Sunday

afternoons up on the mountains with their families.

"The root of the trouble," they told me, "lies in bad government. The reason that there is more disorder in Catalonia is that the people are more progressive, and less willing to take things lying down. We have 200,000 syndicalists—100,000 in Barcelona alone where the total population is about 700,000. The trouble will go on, there will never be more than a truce, until industrial and political conditions for the workers greatly improve. The syndicalists, of course, demand the socialization of all property and industry. They will be content with nothing less."

"Is it true," I asked, "that the present strike is being financed with money sent in from Russia?"

They laughed at me. "Everything is called Bolshevik now," they said. "No, the Russian revolution has had no direct influence on Spain. It has merely had the general effect of making the bourgeoisie more willing to stand up and deliver. In some trades the wages have almost doubled since the Russian Revolution. Yes, we have been pro-Ally in the War. The victory for the Allies has helped all liberal movements. Now that the Allies have won, the Social Revolution will be easier."

"When do you expect the Social Revolution?" I asked.

"Probably in three or four years. It will probably start in France or in Italy. Then Spain will join in. It would be foolish for Spain to start it alone. The European governments would crush it just as they are trying to crush the revolution in Russia."

These boys assured me that the world is now coming to the dawn of a new era, similar to that which began nineteen hundred years ago. The new age will be marked by a new definition of the rights and uses of property.

The next day I went into the barber-shop and upon leaving offered the barber a tip. He politely declined it. I discovered that the Barbers' Syndicate forbids the taking of tips. If the man who served me had accepted the tip he would have lost his position and would have been unable to secure another in the entire city. The unions are very sensitive about tips. They even posted notices on the streets—a favorite method of propaganda in Spain—saying, "How is it that while there are laws against begging in the streets the waiters are allowed to take tips in restaurants?" Surely Syndicalism would have its compensations even for the bourgeoisie.

After careful investigations, extending over a period of six weeks, north, south, east and west, I am persuaded that while no organized revolution is being planned, such a feeling of discontent exists as will cast a shadow over the future. It is not the organization of revolution which Spain has to fear, but the unorganized revolution, such as came to Russia. The careful correspondent of the *London Times* reported to his paper in February:

"Ordinary corrupt government is not new in Spain, and the country has a life of its own which goes on, however heavily burdened, independently of politics. But the dangers which threaten from the meeting of the backwash of that corrupt current with the new tides of ideas which the war has set loose among the industrial classes are quite new, and it is doubtful whether there is any adequate machinery in the country to cope with them. I refer to the remarkable development of the syndicalist organizations which, with Barcelona as their headquarters, bid fair to take hold of the whole economic life of the country, with results which it would not be possible to predict."

In the face of this chaos which reaches far and wide throughout the country, what is the strength of the moderate opinion? The answer is not reassuring. Strictly speaking, Spain has practically no Center. It has only a Right and a Left. The Cortez has a Center, vague and difficult to define, but there, and yet that Center is already surrendering, on the one side to the Right, on the other to the Left. It is not a vital force anyway. It does not correspond to any social grouping among the mass of the people.

Spain has no Center because it has no middle class. There are no farmers; the farmers are peasants except in some few districts of the north where there is a relatively larger class of small rural land-holders. The skilled artisan is just a skilled artisan, not very skilled either. He wears a cap and a smock, possesses no vested interest in anything except his job, which is badly paid and uncertain. He is more intelligent than the peasant, thinks more, and therefore feels even more acutely that he belongs to the submerged groups. The small manufacturer and the small shop owner do not belong anywhere. They are hopelessly in the minority and are the Center only in the sense that they occupy a position where they can be abused from both sides. The professional class is small, teachers are relatively few, and poorly trained. There is no great body of intelligent, sober-minded people who have a stake both in progress and in law and order. The lack of equilibrium throughout the Peninsula is due to the fact that so many people

have practically nothing to lose and everything to gain. The mass of the people would get behind any sort of a movement that showed even a faint prospect of success.

"Spain is in danger of losing her independence," said one very thoughtful observer.

"What do you mean?" I asked. "No nation wants to annex Spain."

"Quite true," he replied, "but it is also true that no nation wants Spain to be revolutionary. If revo-

lution should start here now, and succeed, the other nations would be just as much interested in Spain as they are now interested in Russia."

I found a general expectation that the Allies would intervene if revolution broke out. But what a task the Allies would have on their hands! There is so little to build on. The present policy of the Allies appears to be to strengthen the hands of those who are now in power with a view to preventing revolution. And many Spanish people resent that policy bitterly.

Statesmanship and Prophecy

The following address was delivered by Count De Tocqueville to an hostile audience in the French Chamber of Deputies on the eve of the Revolution of 1848. Would not such an indictment of the spirit of government hold as true to-day? And would it fall on more attentive ears if spoken in the legislative halls of Paris, London or Washington?

GENTLEMEN, I may be deceived, but it seems to me that the present state of people's minds in this country is such as to create alarm and distress. For my own part I sincerely declare that for the first time I feel a special dread for the future. A peculiar uneasiness, an undefined dread, pervades the minds of men,—the sentiment, the instinct of instability. That sentiment, which is the precursor of revolutions, and sometimes produces them, exists now to a very grave degree. The Minister of Finance attributes it to certain special causes, to certain recent accidental events in political life, which have agitated the minds of men, and to words which have roused their passions.

"Gentlemen, I fear that in attributing the disease to these causes it is not the disease itself but only the symptoms that have been looked to. I am convinced the malady is not there. This disease which, believe me, will sweep us all away—understand me, *all*!—if we do not beware, is the present condition of the public mind and of public morals. I believe, too, that the government has contributed, and in the gravest manner to increase the danger.

"Gentlemen, when I attentively consider the class who govern, and then turn to those who are governed, I am troubled by what I see in both—I speak not merely of the middle classes, but of all citizens who possess and exercise political rights. What I see there, gentlemen, I can express in a word, public morals are degraded, deeply degraded; public opinions, sentiments and ideas are giving place more and more to private interests, private aims and motives borrowed from private life and private ambitions.

"For my own part I am appalled by it all. Some say there is no danger; they say that as there is no material disorder on the surface revolution is far distant. Gentlemen, allow me to tell you that I think you are deceived. The disorder does not yet appear in overt acts, but it has sunk deeply into the minds of the people. Look at what is passing

among the working classes, though at present I own they are tranquil. It is true they are not agitated by political passions properly so called as much as they formerly were, but do you not see that the agitation is no longer political but social? Do you not know what they are talking about every day? Do you not hear them incessantly declare that all who are above them are incapable and unworthy to govern—that the present distribution of wealth is unjust, and that property does not rest upon a just basis, and do you not believe that, when such passions have penetrated deeply into the minds of the multitude, they must bring about sooner or later, the most fearful revolutions? This, gentlemen, is my profound conviction. I believe we are slumbering upon a volcano. (Murmurs of dissent.) Nay, I am thoroughly convinced of it.

"Now permit me to inquire in a few words, who are the principal authors of these evils. I know that such evils do not all flow from the action of the government, but I have too high an idea of the power which government plays in this world's affairs, not to be convinced that when a great evil is produced in society, a great political evil, a great moral evil,—the Government is largely responsible for it.

"What has the government done then to produce the evil I have just described? What has it done to bring about this deeply seated disorder, first in public and then in private morals.

"I believe it can be said without wounding anybody that the government has again seized upon larger rights, a greater influence, more considerable and more various prerogatives, than it has possessed at any other epoch. It has become infinitely greater than could ever have been imagined, not only by those who gave, but by those who received it in 1830. It may be affirmed on the other hand that the principle of liberty has been less developed than any one could have expected. I pass no judgment on the act itself; I look only at its consequences. If a result so singular and unex-

pected, so strange a turn of human affairs, has baffled some bad passions, some guilty hopes, do you not believe that on witnessing it, many noble sentiments, many disinterested aspirations become extinct—that there has followed from it in many honest hearts an abandonment of all political hopes as illusions, and a real depression of soul?

"But it is especially the underhand, the surreptitious, manner in which this end has been obtained, which has given a fatal blow to public morality. It is by seizing upon old prerogatives which were supposed to have been abolished, by reviving old powers which seemed to have been annulled, by restoring to vigor old laws which people thought had been abrogated, by applying new laws to purposes for which they were not enacted, it is by all these underhand means, by this skillful and patient management, that the government has at last obtained more power, more activity and influence than it ever before possessed in this country."

"This, gentlemen, is what the government has done, and particularly what the present Administration has done. And think you that this manner which I have just called underhand and surreptitious, of recovering power by degrees, of taking it, as it were, by surprise, by using other means than those which the Constitution has granted—think you that this strange spectacle of adroitness and skillful management held up before the world for several years in so vast a theatre—to a whole nation which is looking on, think you that this spectacle has been such as to improve public morals?

"I would not attribute to my opponents dishonorable motives which they have not entertained; I will admit that in making use of the means which I censure they have supposed themselves to be submitting to a necessary evil—that the magnitude of the end concealed from them the danger and the immorality of the means. I admit that it is not by a premeditated desire of acting upon men through their private interests only, as if this were the single chord in their hearts which could be made to vibrate, that the Administration has done this great evil. I know that they have hurried down an inclined plane, on which it was very difficult to hold their ground

THE UNWORTHINESS OF THOSE WHO GOVERN

"When I begin to inquire what has been the real, efficient cause which, at various times among different nations, has brought about the ruin of the classes which hold the reins of government, I find indeed this or that event, this or that man, this or that accident or superficial cause, but believe me, the real cause, the efficient cause which has made men lose power, is that they had become unworthy to hold it.

"Consider, gentlemen, the old French Monarchy: It was stronger than you are; stronger in its origin; it was supported better than you are by ancient usages, by ancestral manners, by venerable creeds; it was stronger than you are, and yet it was prostrated in the dust. And why did it fall? Think you that it was the action of this or that man, the deficit in the finances, Lafayette, Mira-

beau? No, gentlemen, there was a real and more deeply seated cause, and this cause was, that the class which had formed the government, through its indifference, its selfishness and its vices, had become unable and unworthy to govern. That was the true cause.

"Oh, if it is right to have our minds engrossed by patriotic solicitude at all times, how much more incumbent is it upon us to be thus anxious at the present hour. Are you not aware by a sort of instinctive intuition that you cannot analyze, but which is certain, that the ground is heaving anew in Europe? Do you not feel that the air is already stirred by the coming gust of revolution? This movement in the air, no one knows whence it comes or what it produces, or what it will sweep away; but at such a moment will you remain passive spectators of what it is not too strong a phrase to call the degradation of our public life?

"I speak without bitterness; I speak even, as I believe, without party spirit. My profound and settled conviction is that public morals are becoming corrupt, and that this public corruption will bring upon you in a short time, perhaps at an hour which is already at hand, a new revolution. Do you know what may happen in this country within a year, a month, perhaps even a day? You do not, but what you do know is, that the tempest is on the horizon. Will you allow it to burst upon you unawares?

"Gentlemen, I beg you not to do so; I would willingly bend my knees before you, so real and serious do I hold the danger to be. Changes in our system of laws have been mentioned. I am much inclined to believe these changes are not only useful but necessary. But, gentlemen, I am not foolish enough to believe that it is laws alone which shape the destiny of nations. No, it is not even the mechanism of the laws which produces the great events of the world. That which regulates events is the spirit of the government. Keep the laws as they stand if you will, although I believe it will be very wrong in you to do so, yet keep them; retain even the men, if that pleases you, and for my own part I will offer no opposition to your doing so, but for God's sake, change the spirit of the government, for I repeat that spirit is leading us to destruction."

DO IT NOW—Call No. 1

THE fight against universal military training becoming a law of the land during the next three months will be a hard one. But there is hope. Congress shows signs of doubting whether the country wants conscription in time of peace. We urge our readers to tell their representatives it does not, and to write at once for facts and suggestions to Charles T. Hallinan, Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism, Westory Building, Washington, D. C.

THE SEVEN AGES OF MAN

ILLUSTRATED IN FOUR DRAWINGS BY ROCKWELL KENT



*"And one man in his time plays many parts,
His acts being seven ages. At first the infant, . . .*

Published by permission of Rockwell Kent. Copyright 1918.



Then the school-boy . . .



And then the lover. . . .



Then a soldier—"

The University in Khaki

By HERMAN J. MANKIEWICZ

THE ARMY is going in for education at last. If you have no desire to look through your cattle-car to see the world, then at least join the army to receive an education. What a chance for the ubiquitous publicity man—bayonet practice in the morning and a seminar on Tolstoi in the afternoon, with lectures on the practical application of the Fourteen Points every alternate Doomsday evening at eight o'clock. And for those who scorn the cultural subjects, it might be possible to arrange small classes in vocational Greek.

Fortunately, there is no need to speculate on the probable mechanics and practice of the University in Khaki. With unprecedented foresight the authorities have already had them a University—the American E. F. University at Beaune, Cote D'Or, France—and earnest educators and good citizens may with profit study its achievements. The men responsible for its inception and creation were insistent on the fact that it was an experiment—though even before it opened they had ceased to regard it as an experiment but rather hugged it to their breasts as a *fait accompli*—and we would do well to consider carefully the operation of the experiment and its results.

The Y. M. C. A., as ever fiendishly bent on doing something for the dear boys, was the original guiding genius. Under its protection and in its uniforms and with its moneys worked the three members of the Army Educational Commission.

Before the armistice the chief work of the Commissioners had been to make arrangements for qualified army students to attend French and English universities. There are no statistics on the number of students sent to take graduate work at French universities whose knowledge of the French language was confined to doughboy French—conyack, compree, bokoo, combeen, and so forth. The number was very large, however. There is no reason beyond charity to suppose that those who went to English universities were better equipped in this respect.

After the armistice preparations went ahead rapidly for starting the University—one automatically capitalizes it—at Beaune. Teachers recruited in the United States by the Y. M. C. A. were notified to hold themselves in readiness, and an appeal was made to the army for qualified pedagogues. The mountain labored.

And then, in the middle of March, 1919, the University came into being. To be sure, there was little food and less bedding for the students and few text-books for those who cared for that sort of thing—but some efficient person had remembered to provide a Cadillac for the Colonel and to have the officers' quarters wired for electricity. And the Y. M. C. A.'s teachers from Back Home were on hand.

THE TEACHING STAFF

To a large extent these gentlemen were remarkable only as specimens of excellent draft material, with a most extraordinary hatred of the Huns—by which, one was free to assume, they meant the Germans—which they had worked off by keeping the lamp of culture and prohibition burning at home. The true number of these super-patriots, who were keen for letting the Marmes have another go at the Germans in the event of a refusal to sign the Peace Treaty, will never be known. A few elderly and scholarly old men, who had been deluded into believing that the soldiers wanted an education, made up the welcome exception.

The teachers provided on detached service by the Army were of two kinds—officers and enlisted men. Though their work was identical, the officers were fed, quartered and treated like gentlemen—the enlisted men, college graduates and teachers all, like enlisted men. Peculiarly enough, the enlisted men did not object to this—it was but to be expected in a democratic army. That the Y. M. C. A. teachers, however, should receive exceptional treatment was not to be expected.

The enlisted teachers were quartered in the homelike barracks of the army—about one hundred slept in one large room. A convenient wash-house was at their disposal in the morning, after a battalion of colored labor troops had finished using it. A tasty luncheon of beans or slum or goldfish was served to those young educators who cared to line up for it, their mess-gear in hand. Breakfast and dinner were problematical. If you weren't among the first fifty in line you might not get anything at all. Some cynical spirits even considered this a blessing.

The Y. M. C. A. contingent, on a plane with the officers, messed and slept with them. A slight misunderstanding arose in the faculty of the English Department one morning when a Golden Cootie announced to a sergeant and educational colleague

of a combat unit that he was tired of flap-jacks for breakfast.

Golden Cootie is the name given, with a peculiar aptness, by the doughboy student to his revered instructor late of the Y. M. C. A. For the Army took over the educational work of the Y. M. C. A. and its teachers became civilian employees of the Army, with a right to wear the Sam Brown belt and the barracks-cap coat of arms hitherto sacred to officers. A military order was issued by the Commandant, requesting that the military courtesies required for officers be extended to these newly-plumed persons. Three enlisted instructors so far forgot themselves and military discipline as to write letters to the Commandant announcing their passionate intention to languish in the hoosegow for life before consenting to salute Y. M. C. A. workers, in disguise or not.

THE STUDENT BODY

And then the teaching began. Teacher, hopefully surveying the brightly-washed faces upturned to him, would close the door of the shed in which instruction was to be given, seat himself in a corner of the room where the wind did not blow too keenly down his neck, and cast his pearls. Of course, it was impossible for him to assign home-work, which made it rather difficult in writing courses, for his scholars were assigned to road-building after school hours. And, of course, most of the textbooks arrived when the school was about to close. And, of course, with a class part of which had gone through college and part through the Sixth Reader, it was hard to find a common ground. And that thirst for knowledge, which one had been assured was so pronounced, was not much in evidence. The undergraduate mind seemed interested exclusively in food and ocean voyages. But then, like the League of Nations, everything must have a beginning.

After three weeks of what must be called defensive education appeared a most remarkable document. It was, in all, not more than a hundred words in length.

"It has come to the attention of these headquarters that some teachers are discussing with their classes such matters as prohibition, universal military service, etc. While it is desired that the fullest freedom prevail, it must be remembered that this is a military post. Discussions are not encouraged at military posts. The wise teacher will conduct his classes without discussion."

This order, signed by Colonel Ira L. Reeves, the President of the University, was never recalled and remained in force to the very last day. One won-

ders whether the new University in Khaki, thrust upon us by the recruiting posters, will tolerate discussions. Is there a similar order at American universities?

When students were enrolled at the American E. F. University, they were informed that they could either return with their organizations or remain to finish their work at the University, returning as casuals. In theory the earnest young seekers after truth were to do battle for the privilege of remaining at the University. In practice the University finished its first and only term with about half the number of students with which it had begun. It is only fair to those students who remained to say that they had absolutely no opportunity to leave.

But let it not be assumed that all was dead loss. Among other things, parties to tour the battlefields were organized for the gentlemen of the Army Educational Corps, the converted Y. M. C. A. teachers. It can be imagined with what tender relish their young charges, who had been on these battlefields only once and at a time when the opportunities for sight-seeing were small, watched their revered professors depart. And, O! the rapture with which one listened to their inevitable reminiscences and information when they returned. Leaves to Paris were granted to officers and Golden Cooties—enlisted students and instructors were permitted to make educational trips to Lyons for the week-end, until one terrible day when the Lyons prophylactic return was made, and then this too was abolished.

THE FRAUD AND FARCE OF ARMY EDUCATION

If the American E. F. University, however, were merely another example of the waste and silly caste-distinctions of our army overseas, there would be little sense to treating of it. Nor is it of moment to write the history of that band of gallant Hun-haters, which was at Chateau-Thierry in 1919. (Printed mention must be made, nevertheless, of the gifted Golden Cootie, an instructor in English, who asked his class of doughboys to write, for their first theme, on "The Flowers of France, with particular reference to the Lily.")

But there is an excellent reason for dragging the American E. F. University out of the limbo of things one wishes one could forget, and that reason is the question of universal military training. The University, which was, to the nth degree, a fraud and a farce, is being used as the trump card of the advocates of universal military training, and an extensive publicity campaign, with the University

as reference and point of departure, is already under way in the press of the country. There will be pointing with pride and viewing with regret. And several of our foremost educators, the chair of Cabinet Secretary for Education before their eyes if they succeed, will plead for a combination of universal military training and education.

We shall hear much of the success of the American E. F. University, of its total enrollment, of its art school—the only art school in the world where

the student was sure of bed and board for an indefinite period—, of its vast theatre—where a performance was stopped by the enlisted students because attendance was limited only to officers and Golden Cooties—, of its inspection by General Pershing—whose speech was rudely interrupted by cries of "When do we go home?"—and of its this and that *ad nauseam*. But here and there peculiar people may be found who would like to know the real facts as to what happens when the Army is entrusted with the education of young Americans.

A Book and Some Posters

ONE DAY, while I was reading Henri de Man's "The Remaking of a Mind,"* I chanced to visit the New York Public Library, and found there an absorbingly interesting exhibit of war posters from almost all countries. I revisited that exhibit again and again for it seemed to me that these posters illustrate and criticise de Man's book more effectively than any reviewer could possibly do.

Henri de Man before the war was a strong anti-militarist leader in the international labor movement. He was one of the few Belgian socialists who negotiated with the German Social Democrats, up to the very eve of the war, in an effort to prevent the tragic conflict. Two days before the declaration of war he saw Haase, in a last attempt to do something effective, but in those days the diplomats and nationalists were more powerful than the internationalists, and the socialists of Europe were swept into the currents of war along with the rest. As a Belgian, de Man was naturally so outraged by the German invasion of his country that he became a soldier. I remember I saw him in Petrograd in May, 1917, when he and Emile Vandervelde were addressing a meeting in the city hall, and congratulating the people on the revolution. The audience was particularly impressed when de Man said, "You must imagine, citizens, what it means to me, an intransigent anti-militarist, to come to you dressed in a military uniform." He then went on to appeal on behalf of his country for help in continuing the war against Germany. I was struck by the deep sincerity of the man. So I was, therefore, all the more interested in reading his book which is a kind of summary of the lessons of the war as learned by a frank and open spirit. Yet the more carefully I read the more I felt the need of checking up his conclusions by turning to the posters on exhibition in the Public Library.

The main interest of the book lies in some clear conclusions which uncover many of our war illusions. Maintaining that the war was democratic and that it sought to bring about a new freedom de Man sees nevertheless that

"It is easier to make a civilian in Chicago, who reads his newspaper at breakfast, curse the Kaiser and wish he could throttle the Crown Prince, than to make a soldier cross a bit of ground swept by machine-gun bullets, to go and kill people whom he has never seen and against whom he has no individual grudge." (P. 157.)

And again,

"I knew well enough that if there were nothing to make them [the Belgian soldiers] fight but the desire to see Germany punished for having broken a pledge, or to make the world safe for democracy, they would rather have left the fighting for the others. . . . All that is necessary is that elementary precaution be taken to formulate a pretext, plausible enough for popular credulity to set the machinery in motion. . . . In the hitherto prevailing European system of compulsory popular armaments as instruments for international competition it was always possible for any ruling power, even in a democratic country, to make an army fight." (P. 178.)

"Plausible pretexts," "popular credulity," "the machinery in motion"—how the war posters in the Library illustrate these phrases! There is one on which we read in blood-red letters, Lloyd George's pledge in behalf of his country, that England will not cease to fight "until the rights of smaller nations are placed on an unassailable foundation." Did he mean the unassailable foundation of the rights of Ireland, or Egypt, or India to die for England's sake? Another poster written in Chinese and in French, on a silk French flag, holds out fair promises to China. Would the authors of the peace treaty be ashamed to see it now? These are only two of many posters which in the stillness of the library seem like mocking ghosts whose unfulfilled promises still make them live to plague us. Is it possible that these fine sentiments after all were only so many appeals to popular credulity?

THE SINEWS OF WAR

Another set of posters appealing for national loans, are a rare commentary on the economic background of the war. "Credit Lyonnaise," "Banque Nationale," "Deutsche Reichsbank," "Banco Italiano di Sconto," and so forth; blue, red and green posters cry only one word: "Invest!"

* Chas. Scribner's Sons (New York).

Souscrivez! Sottoscrivette!" One artistic picture shows two sorrowful little children with pleading faces and the inscription, "Nostro padre ha dato la vita, voi non negherete il denaro—Sottoscrivette!" or as our American posters put it, "They gave their lives, you lend your dollars." Art, love of children, innocence, all to enforce the eternal appeal, Lend us your money.

Polish posters crowned with fine ornaments and national symbols remind us of the time when Pilsudsky, later minister of War in Poland, organized Polish legions within the ranks of the German-Austrian armies while many of his present colleagues were fighting on the side of the Allies. Russian Tsarist posters tell of the horrors of German atrocities and emphasize the danger of yielding to the enemy, but they tell nothing of the foul deeds of the Tsarist generals; of organized massacres in East Prussia, or of Jewish pogroms in Galicia and Poland.

A poster signed by General Scheidemann of the Russian General Staff, on August 25, 1914, is not without interest in these days. It calls upon the German army and population of East Prussia to lay down their arms before the Russian and Allied democracy, and exclaims emphatically and happily "Wo ist die Russische Revolution?" (Where is the Russian Revolution?) And this is the same Russian General who has been reported lately as co-operating with Yudenitch and the British in the last campaign against the Soviet armies.

Here too is a Bolshevik poster, calling for war against the Germans. It reads: "The last and decisive hour has struck! The White Guard of General Hoffmann and William II. are advancing to crush the Russian revolution!" One wonders as he gazes upon this poster whether it was paid for by the German gold which the reactionary press still insists bribed the Bolsheviks.

But most paradoxical of all, in the light of present events, is a German poster containing the Kaiser's proclamation of August 6, 1914. "We deal," it declares, "with the existence or non-existence of the German state." It is strange and painful to think that after years of terrible suffering and the death of thousands of brave men these words, wholly false at the time of their utterance, have been made true in the end. The treaty of peace all but destroyed the existence of the German state, and a phrase which in 1914 was only a "pre-text plausible enough for popular credulity," has come to sound something like truth.

THE FAILURE OF FORCE

Henri de Man wrote his book before the Treaty was signed, but its general terms had already been foreshadowed and in one of his chapters we read:

"Even in our peace loving democratic countries, which entered the war to do away with militarism, the necessity to use military means for that purpose created within a large section of the population a kind of enthusiasm that, if it be not checked, will make the remedy we have used to cure the world of military intoxication worse than the evil itself."

"If it be not checked"—aye there's the rub.

Through the sincerity of this Belgian socialist we feel a kind of naivete not unlike the popular credulity he writes about. He does not seem to see that militarism cannot be checked by the old means, that a war to end war cannot be made without creating a machinery of militarism, that war is in itself an intoxicating madness created in the popular mind by those who knew the "pretexts which are plausible enough,"—in short, that the ultimate ends of modern national wars are criminally imperialistic however they may be embellished by pictures and by words.

Unfortunately "The Remaking of a Mind" discovers for us no new way out of the maze; it illustrates rather how even a pure and clear mind can be shaken by the "machinery set in motion." De Man is gentle, mild, he does not seem to see the moral ruin brought about by the war. Would he, like his friend Vandervelde, have put his signature to the Parisian Brest-Litovsk; or perchance does he now see clearly the truth as reflected in a comparison of the Versailles documents with the posters gathered in the Public Library? If so, there might come to his memory those lines in "Hamlet":

Polonius. What do you read, my lord?
Hamlet. Words, words, words.
Polonius. What is the matter, my lord?
Hamlet. Between whom?
Polonius. The matter you are reading, my lord?
Hamlet. Slanders, Sir.

GREGORY ZILBOORG.

Death and Life in India

THE British inquiry into the recent disturbances in the Punjab has resulted in shocking revelations of military ruthlessness near Amritsar. Without warning a peaceful out-of-door meeting was fired on by soldiers and the firing continued for almost ten minutes. At the end of that time over 500 persons were dead and three times that number wounded,—and these were left without aid to get what relief they could. These things were done at the direct command of the responsible British General, one Dyer. The impression of these and other acts of cruelty is not likely to be much mitigated by the news that the British House of Commons has at last passed the Montague-Chelmsford bill, an act which when approved by the House of Lords will give India a somewhat increased but still very much restricted measure of self-government.

More important to our mind than such political reform is the remarkable development of the co-operative movement in certain parts of India. For instance, the state of Mysore (governed by a Rajah and an elected council), with a population of less than six million, has a Co-operative League, with 1256 societies and 90,000 members. The great majority of the co-operative societies are credit societies but there are also co-operative stores and weaving societies. When it is remembered what the co-operative movement has meant in Europe it is not easy to overestimate the social significance of this beginning in India.

Liquidating Spiritual War Contracts

By HAROLD A. LARRABEE

AT THE sudden ending of the war over a year ago it was estimated that the United States Government had committed itself to emergency war contracts amounting to some ten billions of dollars for food, clothing, munitions, ships, and the various material needs of a warring nation. Since that time the authorities have been busily engaged in liquidating these engagements at so much on the dollar, until now we are informed by the press that only two billions remain unadjusted, and that these will be cleared from the books by the expenditure of some three hundred and twenty-six millions of the taxpayers' money.

But what about the great spiritual war contracts of the Government, the enormous stores of morale for which the leaders of the nation contracted with its citizens, as surely as for the material of war? Are these not to be liquidated also?

A year ago hundreds of factories manufacturing non-essentials were turned into temporary plants for the production of munitions. Priority schedules of all sorts were rigorously enforced. Industry was in the hands of the General Staff, and nothing was allowed to interfere with the maximum support of our armies in the field.

Similarly the churches were marshalled for military purposes and welded into an efficient organization for Government propaganda. Under the spell of idealistic leadership the churches accepted war contracts for the production of the fighting spirit and civilian morale as readily as automobile makers undertook contracts for shells. Preachers tended more and more to deliver from their pulpits Washington-inspired sentiments. Many churches became spy-hunting bureaus of the first order.

But to many the transformation of bodies of organized good-will into ultra-patriotic defense (and offense) leagues was a denial of Christian principles. They felt that the propaganda for alien-baiting and espionage was as out of place in the pulpit as a shell-making machine in the chancel. For them the war was a desperate dilemma in which it had become necessary to declare a moratorium on Christianity.

But for some, how easy was the transformation from hell-fire agencies into recruiting stations for the tribal Jahweh, nationalized for the occasion? The acceptance of a war morale contract meant no

more to some preachers than the change from preaching fear of damnation to proclaiming the beneficial effects of tar and feathers.

That certain advantages were gained by the close association of the churches with each other and with the Government for the purpose of uniform moral judgments on the war, none can deny. These unifying influences, under enlightened leadership, must be preserved, to complete the destruction of provincialism and narrowness in our hinterland.

But those super-patriots who remain hypnotized at the sight of a uniform, should try to understand what has happened in the world of commerce. With the conclusion of the Armistice all was changed. The industrial world responded like a flash. "War-baby" enterprises crumpled; mushroom powder towns lost their inhabitants as quickly as they had gained them. Production resumed its pre-war status and began to make up for lost time.

Not so with some of our churches. From many pulpits the sermons on the issues of reconstruction have given forth the ancient sounds of war ideals and morals. Few preachers, apparently, have been able to penetrate the surface of "Americanization" programs based on coercion, threats, and suspicion. There is nothing to indicate a disbelief on the part of some Christian leaders in "squad-right" and "squad-left" as twin pillars in the temple of character building. They are still under the spell of military dictatorship. They do not seem able to realize that there is no more need for loyalty to conscription programs for the future nor for thoughtless applause for incipient war moves in the direction of our neighbors.

IT IS TIME TO END THE MORATORIUM OF CHRISTIANITY

What is needed is that the churches shall be aroused to their neglected functions as agents of good-will. The time for clap-trap jingoism about the "redigion of the flag" is past if it ever properly was with us. Preachers who continue to ventilate pleas for solidarity of opinion behind military programs are as anomalous as gunsmiths who continue, at this late date, to deliver Brownings. It is time for men who believe in malice toward none and charity for all to awake from the anæsthetic of the espionage act and make themselves heard.

The churches have an unexampled opportunity in one specific direction at this moment. It was the

hope of all men during the war that, if nothing else, the overwhelming horror of the world conflict would teach the world a lesson it would never forget. The time to capitalize the universal disgust of the last five years will pass. It is latent now in the mind of every man who went through the blood and the muck. But time passes, and men, fortunately, are permitted to forget.

The danger is that adulation will turn the heads of the veterans and that mere reminiscence will rob the trenches of their criminality. Our soldiers once swore, to a man, that "this shall never happen again!" But to the heroes and survivors of a victorious conflict the idea of banishing war appears as something almost despicable. Who does not see

that these men can become the greatest force for peace ever dreamed of; or an equally strong impetus toward the Prussianization of our youth? They need moral leadership from the churches, not from the General Staff nor from the National Security League.

But the churches are still suffering from a kind of shell-shock. They signed up their morale contracts, and delivered the goods. Meanwhile their normal output of spirituality petered out all but completely.

Now is the time to liquidate all that remains of these contracts, and get back with a new vigor to the Christian task of making the General Staff superfluous and non-existent.

The Interventionists Show Their Hand

FOR the moment relations with Mexico are less critical. Mr. Hansen, the bondsman of the notorious Mr. Jenkins, may live in history as the man who averted war at the moderate price of putting up \$500 bail. Senator Fall's melodramatic tale about a Mexican plot to recover the "lost provinces" was just a little too crude to "get over." Nevertheless it doubtless has added to the sum of American mistrust of Mexico, which a horde of propagandists, skillful and unskillful, are striving continually to increase to the danger point.

At present the tactics of the interventionists are not for immediate war but for the withdrawal of recognition from the Carranza Government. They doubtless know that in existing circumstances to take this step and yet avoid war would be about as difficult as to step out of a twentieth story window in the hope of stopping at the tenth.

The real source of all the outcry against Carranza is made plain by the last charge of the oil operators. He is preventing, they say, the drilling of new oil wells and in consequence the diminution of the oil supply threatens American shipping interests. The complete and final answer to this charge is found in an editorial in the *New York World* on December 12th:

"On Nov. 26 the Director of the United States Geological Survey sent a letter to a member of the Shipping Board who had asked for information about the oil situation in Mexico. This letter gave 209 as the number of productive wells in operation. Their estimated daily potential capacity was placed at 1,592,741 barrels and their actual daily capacity at 174,872 barrels.

"What has become of the difference between a potential capacity of 1,592,741 barrels and an actual capacity of 174,872 barrels, and what renders these ten new wells, for which the Carranza Government has refused drilling permits, so immediately necessary to prevent a fuel-oil famine?

"Is it not a fact that the oil interests in Mexico

have neither the pipe lines nor the tankage to take care of the capacity flow from the wells that they have already drilled? Is it not a further fact that this flurry over the action of the Carranza Government is merely a by-product of the organized propaganda of the oil interests and the interventionists?"

THE latest move of the interventionists is distinctly clever. They have started a "Childhood Conservation League," a sort of Moral Aims Committee. It was launched in New York a few days ago with an expensive banquet at the Waldorf Astoria. The speakers expressly disclaimed any intention of advising intervention but they painted dreary pictures of life in Mexico admirably calculated to fill the audience with a desire to carry the light of American civilization (and Standard Oil?) to "darkest Mexico." This Childhood Conservation League is skillfully designed to break down the opposition to war of the churches and civic bodies. Protestant missionaries have been secured to bless it. The Association for the Protection of American Rights, so called, has even gone so far as to send out a letter describing the League as the "Industrial and Social Relation Department of the Inter-Church Movement"—a connection which, we rejoice to see, the latter organization has unequivocally denied. It is also encouraging to note that undecieved by this artful propaganda the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions has reiterated in plain English its unqualified opposition to intervention. But we must be on our guard. The Intervention Devil has many disguises. Sometimes at a distance he can look like an angel of light.

When Robert Owen, the founder of the cooperative movement, suggested that British workers should have a 12-hour day instead of a 14-hour day, he was regarded as a revolutionary.
LORD LEVERHULME.

Prisoners and Captives

This is the first of a series of articles in which we shall give those whom society rarely hears a chance to tell their story. The writer of the following article, an ex-soldier, was sentenced to Blackwell's Island for "disorderly conduct" i. e. giving away leaflets urging Russia's cause and India's. Our concern here is not with the justice of his sentence but with the effect of the kind of prison he describes upon men whom society avowedly wants to reform.

I.—On Blackwell's Island

THERE are two ways of going to Blackwell's Island in New York Harbor. First, by pass obtained at the Municipal Building. Second, by the aid of the police courts. The latter is the way I went there.

Blackwell's Island is in the middle of the Harlem River, one end near South Ferry and the other above 225th Street. In it are many government buildings, such as hospitals and their laundries, penitentiary and workhouse. If you take the second means of visiting the Island, you will be looked after, that is cared for, by a government official. But his services may not be agreeable. However, you will not be lost.

On Monday, the 21st of April, I was arrested late in the afternoon near the embarkation hospital in New York City.

The arrest was made by an officer of the Red Cross corps. I was taken to the hospital where I was not allowed to say anything, instead I was struck behind the ear several times and roundly cursed by several officers. Their special object was to place me in the hands of the federal authorities, but I was later turned over to the police.

I was first taken to the police station, searched, and some of my property was taken away. Later I was taken to the night court at 53rd St. for trial. There I lost everything by another search. When I was called before the judge I was told that I could telephone to my friends, and that if I did not wish to be tried then I could be tried later on. The next morning I was sent to the Jefferson Market Court, where my case came up at 3 P.M. On Thursday, the 24th, I was sentenced to one month at the Blackwell's Island Workhouse.

Next morning I was taken to the 26th Street boat landing, where other prisoners from all parts of the city were herded together awaiting the boat. We landed on the Island at 11 A.M. and were taken to the bath-house and ordered to remove our clothes. In that condition we remained for nearly an hour. When we were ordered to bathe we were not provided with soap or towels. After we had bathed we were obliged to wait another hour for the official to come and record our identification marks. The time was not spent in a very agreeable

manner. Then we were sent to another room and our finger prints taken. The clothing given to us was dirty, and no care whatsoever was taken to see that it fitted. At Jefferson Market Court I had two blankets; no pillows. Here on the Island we are given two dirty blankets; a pillow as filthy as anything can be, with slips which apparently are never washed, clean underwear (mine was much too small); socks, brogan shoes; dirty, ragged, woolen outside clothes; cap to match without a vizer, color grey. All dressed in this fashion, we were sent to the cells without any midday dinner, and were kept there until four o'clock, when supper was served: peaches and war bread, and a liquid something which they called tea. Our cold and dirty cells measure 14 feet by 9 and are 10 feet high; they contain eight woven wire spring beds fastened to the wall. The bucket system is used, there being neither toilets nor cuspidors for the prisoners.

The cells are unlocked at six in the morning, and we go down to a wash room about 25 ft square, with 18 faucets. Here four hundred men wash their faces in fifteen minutes. Two keepers stay in the room and hurry the men out. Of course there is not time enough to wash oneself properly; towels are taken away and are not seen again until next morning. Imagine a man at the grimy work of unloading coal and then at the end of the day being told to use his shirt for a towel.

One third of the prisoners are old men, wrecks of the social system; about thirty are moral degenerates; many are boys under twenty years of age. The average total number of prisoners on the Island varies between 445 and 475.

Papers and books are unknown. Through the commissary you can buy sugar, soap and toilet preparations. Your letters are opened before you get them, but I do not think they are read.

When I came here I was handcuffed to an old man of 79 years, who had cooties on him that did not come from the trenches. With us also came a soldier and sailor in uniform. The soldier had just returned from France and was a parole violator from the penitentiary where he was going to finish his sentence. Saturday morning at 8 o'clock we went to work unloading coal from a barge that contained

seven hundred tons. We left our work and went to eat our dinner without being given a chance of washing ourselves. That week from Saturday noon till Tuesday morning we stayed in our cold damp cells, lying around on wire beds full of pests.

The dining room is sixty feet by fifty—about one sixth of the space is partitioned off for the keeper. The food served is necessarily very poor. I was told by several officials there that the daily allowance for each man before the war—sixteen cents—has not been increased. I can eat the soup for dinner, but cannot manage the stew. Salt can be had only once in a while. Tea and coffee are alike and look and taste like dirty dish water. I am told

that this fluid is made from burnt bread crumbs, without sugar or milk. I believe it. Much coughing is heard at meals.

The keepers are generally good men, though there are exceptions. So far I have been treated fairly by all with whom I have come into contact.

I didn't sleep much on Monday night. The keepers were rehashing the Irish question. Both England and Ireland were represented. The noises at night are horrible: coughing, spitting . . .

The keepers swear at the whole world.

And it is so abominably cold.

There's a stench . . .

X. Y. Z.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

The Building Trades Parliament Is Only a Sop to Cerberus

DESPOTISM tempered by conversation" seems a fair classification of the Building Trades Parliament as outlined in your December number. Toleration and the English spirit of compromise might be added to the characterization for good measure.

Of course the Parliament isn't really a Parliament: and here is the essential weakness of the entire arrangement as a lasting institution. Only a genuine industrial democracy will satisfy the world. The Englishman of yesterday would not tolerate a Parliament that could merely discuss and advise with a hereditary king; owner and operator of the political state. The Englishman of tomorrow will not tolerate a Building Trades Parliament that can only discuss and advise with the industrial autocrats who own and operate the building industry.

No amount of benevolence can save a despot. This is a political axiom today. It will be an industrial axiom tomorrow. The willingness—even the practical necessity—of the employers to follow the advice of the present Building Trades Parliament may stave off the inevitable, but it can afford no permanent satisfaction. Concessions as to limitation of profits, prevention of unemployment, and the like, can be only sops to the world's greatest Cerberus: the rightful passion of the workers for industrial self-government.

When the Building Trades Parliament assumes complete and actual ownership and control of the building industry, when "owners" are finally excluded from its deliberations and only workers and public officials are admitted, then and then only will it be a Parliament in any real sense of the word; then and then only will it have any genuine stability in this world of democratic upheaval.

EVANS CLARK.

New York City.

The Significance of the Foster Committee's Report

THE ACCOUNT in your December issue of the Foster Report on Organized Public Service in the building industry in Great Britain is very impressive. I take it that so far it is a report of a com-

mittee and will have to be ratified by both the employers and the unions as a whole. If it should be accepted it would furnish an experiment of very great importance, the results of which would everywhere be watched with the keenest of interest.

It will be a thing worth noting if employers begin to fight low production and inefficiency by fighting the things that produce them instead of taking it out in cursing the workers.

There is no question but that restriction of output, both conscious and unconscious—and there is more of the latter than there is of the former—is due in the main to the causes enumerated in the Foster Report. If the methods proposed can be put into effect they will probably develop human efficiency beyond even the dreams of those who propose the plan, for they will be setting human initiative free. When you do that, no one can safely predict the limits of achievement. In addition to the manifest effects that this will have on industry, it will have equally immeasurable effects on something infinitely greater—the human mind and soul.

To make the plan a success, one necessary thing would be absolute control of the admission to the industry of either new workers or new employers. It is difficult to see how this could be done unless the building industry were treated like the public utilities in Wisconsin where you have to get a certificate of "convenience and necessity" from the Railroad Commission before you can start developing a new street car line or electric light plant. But there is no final reason why the building industry should not be treated that way.

JOHN A. FITCH.

New York City.

Upton Sinclair Recants

THE writer of that article "Peace and the Pro-War Liberals," in your last issue, is right, Professor Dewey's recantation is far from satisfactory. But has your correspondent noticed that Upton Sinclair spoke up handsomely in "The Appeal to Reason" for November 29th, thus:

Don't you know that the voice of Debs is ringing from one end of America to the other, that the picture of Debs in prison lives in the hearts of millions of working men and women? And why? Is it not because they know that Debs is a man of peace, a man

who has fought all his life for peace and who could not by any force on earth be brought to hurt one of his fellow-men? I wish that I could say that my record was as clean as that of Debs. But I justified violence once in my life; I called for violence against the German Kaiser. I don't mean to discuss that question here; I had some provocation which I might cite, but I will only state that the result of my resort to violence has not been such as to encourage me to believe in it, or to wish to continue it. I merely say that I have had enough of violence, and that I want to try some other method against the profiteurs and exploiters of America."

New York City.

F. G. W.

A Tragic Appeal from Austrian Women

I HAVE received a copy of the following appeal. Many will be grateful if you will give it publicity in your columns:—

"To the women of all countries: Mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, to all those who are capable of feeling love and pity this appeal of pain is addressed. Do not suffer it any longer, not a day longer, that in far-off Siberia, in Turkestan and in Caucasus there are still hundreds of thousands of men imprisoned, while at home their families are mad with grief and despair. . .

"Of all the cruelties of the war this seems to be the worst because it is the most lasting and most senseless torture of all. Of all the misery caused by the war, this is the most irritating, because it is so utterly devoid of reason. The poor little Austrian Republic alone has a hundred and fifty thousand of her sons out there who are only sustained by the thought of coming home. If you were to read the sad letters of those young men, who have seen the world only through a hole in a board or through a barbed wire fence for five years, who write, 'If they do not send us home very soon, they need not bother about bringing us home any more, for we cannot live through another winter here,' you would weep to think of the poor broken hearts of their families.

"You, women of all countries, suppose your own son, your own husband, your own brothers out there among those unhappy ones! Would you wait till peace was ratified? Would you be silent and wait patiently while time flies? No, you would not, and you ought not to! Every one of you is responsible for this injustice, is guilty of wrong-doing, if she does not try with all her might to help the prisoners to get home. Fill the world with your protests! Keep on asking, warning, and insisting! You bear all the responsibility now for all the misery in the world, not by causing it, but by not hindering it. It is your duty now to rouse the public conscience. Stand up, women of all nations, and do your duty to all humanity!

"Freie Vereinigung
der Mütter und Frauen von Kriegsgefangenen
in Russland, Sibirien und Turkestan."

New York City.

A. R. H.

Answers to Correspondents

O. V. F. (Boston, Mass.)—The quotation you are seeking is in Boswell's Life of Johnson. It runs as follows: "Patriotism having become one of our topics, Johnson suddenly uttered, in a strong determined tone, an apothegm, at which many will start: 'Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.' But let it be considered that he did not mean a real and generous love of country, but that pretended patriotism which so many in all ages and countries have made a cloak for self-interest."

Another opinion on patriotism which you may be

glad to have is Sir Horace Walpole's: "A patriot, girl! Why, patriots spring up like mushrooms! I have raised many of them in one night. It is but refusing to gratify an unreasonable and insolent demand and up starts a patriot."

C. G. D. (Chicago, Illinois).—Three suggestions occur to us in answer to your enquiry for a trustworthy survey of foreign opinion. (1) *The Nation* publishes every week an admirable International Supplement. (2) *The Cambridge Magazine* of England gives several pages each week to well-chosen extracts (translated into English) from a wide range of the European press. The subscription, \$1.00 for four months, should be sent to *The Cambridge Magazine*, 6 Kings Parade, Cambridge, England. (3) The valuable weekly edition of *The Manchester Guardian*. A postal card to the Chandler Building, New York City, will bring you a sample copy.

B. V. (Burlington, Vt.).—The poem by Clement Wood beginning "Come, War, come, dread destruction, come!" which appeared in our issue for September, 1918, is included in a collection of Mr. Wood's verses entitled "The Earth Turns South," recently published by Dutton & Co., New York, price \$1.50.

N. S. (New York City).—We gladly welcome the subscriptions you send us for friends in Holland and Germany. We have now nearly 300 subscribers in different parts of Europe. Will you help us treble this number before the end of 1920?

J. W. (Barnesville, Ohio).—We hope other readers will follow your excellent example of guaranteeing the sales of a dozen copies of *The World Tomorrow* each month at a local newstand. We are glad to hear that your helpful experiment is justifying your faith in us.

L. P. (St. Louis, Mo.).—You are, alas, only too correct in your judgment, but now and again we hear of exceptions, for example, the Rev. Dr. Parkes Cadman, of Brooklyn said recently: "The trouble is that we have lived up to none of our promises. One hundred thousand of our dead in France and Flanders ask why we have not, and no Congressman has yet answered."

B. T. (Cleveland, Ohio).—We are interested to hear that Mr. James A. Beck, the former Attorney General, thinks that "the worker must be taught that his happiness depends upon the quantity of his production, and that it is fallacious to believe that less work and more wages will solve his problems." We quite agree with you that Mr. Beck should go to the workers and do this sort of teaching himself,—they might not be the only people to learn something.

THE CHOPPER

I swing my ax:
Split is an old door sill worn by the entrance and departure of generations.

I swing my ax:
Broken is a weathered gray window-frame through which a longing farmwife saw her budding life grow choked with weeds.

I swing my ax:
Splintered is a rain-stained rafter under which a forgotten neighborhood epic opened and closed.

I swing my ax:
Shattered will be all things
Not built of the spirit.

ERNEST M. HUNT.

The Failure of Half Democracy

By HORACE A. EATON

DURING the last months even the most hopeful have awakened to the fact that we are not ready for a true and lasting peace. The peace we have now is a failure because we did not a generation ago make democracy an honorable political fact. Therein lies the great unpreparedness of the Allied Nations in 1914 and 1916 as well as in 1919.

It requires but little reading in political history of the last fifty years to see how far wrong democratic nations—even though the best are but partly democratic—could go. Even we, in our own United States, have not always treated our weak neighbors with disinterested forbearance; and some of our Allies are not less guilty of self-seeking, of high-handed and unjust action. We have all done unto others what we would not have had others do unto us, with the pharisaical assumption that our interests have been of more value to the world than those of our neighbors. The history of democracy consistently fails to show that popular government has been assiduous in spreading the democratic idea through high and noble example; it fails to show that popular government necessarily means national and international righteousness. With a century of opportunity, the democracies of the world have neglected to prepare in the right way against the dangers that have threatened the very existence of the democratic principle itself.

Let us suppose that the liberal nations of the world had been dedicated to their high mission; let us suppose that they had established, even through the last quarter of a century, a new standard of international relations, a standard of righteousness and fair dealing; suppose that all nations, big and little, white and black and yellow, had come to recognize that they could always get a square deal from the democratic states of the world; that they could count upon just trade conditions, disinterested adjustments of boundaries, a readiness to discuss honestly, publicly, and with the will to friendship all possible dangers—had democracy done all this it would indeed have been making the world safe. But, alas, there was no such preparation. The cut-throat principles of competition prevailed; the nations relied upon their strength, not upon the power of justice, till, were the names deleted from the records, the future student could not tell which were the autocratic, which the democratic nations in the various struggles. The world

was for the strong and wily—and the devil might take the hindmost!

The principles of democratic justice and freedom have never been given a fair chance. Had they been fairly tried there would have been no world war. Democracy would have conquered before it fought, for autocracy, based upon the self-interest of a few, would never have been able to justify to its victims the need for a vast military force with which to defend the "fatherland." And these self-seeking governments would have been overthrown by the irresistible force of real democracy decades ago. But who will dare to say that pure democratic principles were ever tried? Democracies have paraded in autocratic uniforms, and the present debacle is the measure of their failure.

We are all guilty, for we have failed to live up to the faith which, unfortunately, has been but partly in us. Every honest man must feel penitence as deep and burning as hell, the penitence for things done and for things undone, the penitence for unbelief and insincerity which have made inevitable this cataclysm of our time.

But penitence is futile if it does not bring with it a will to learn the lessons of experience. The failure of democracy in the past, its complicity through weakness and insincerity in bringing about the world war, point the way to the new resolutions which the world must make if it is to create a better world after the war. These great lessons of the past must be learned throughout the liberal world; must be made active in the thought and speech of our leaders of opinion; must be effective on congresses and newspapers; must be fixed as unshakable convictions in the consciences of the nations.

Wisdom we must have, and forbearance; generosity, and, above all, the will to love.

Books Worth Reading

THE PLOT AGAINST MEXICO By L. J. de Bekker. (Alfred Knopf, New York.)

A series of sketches of Mexican life. Valuable for its vigorous attack on the intervention policy of the oil interests, and for John F. Moors' introductory chapter, "Shall We Intervene?" A wide reading of this book may help to avoid the calamity of war.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S LETTERS TO HIS CHILDREN. (Scribners.)

A book for lovers of children, showing Roosevelt's many-sided personality at its best, and revealing a delightful "Americanism," worthy of love and honor, unlike the militaristic chauvinism which is too often associated with that term.

Is a New Party Emerging?

THAT veteran politician, ex-Senator Lewis of Illinois, thinks the Republicans and Democrats may have to unite in 1920 against "the new parties."¹ This will be music in the ears of members of the Labor Party and of the Committee of Forty-eight and proves the radical contention that the difference between the old parties is the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, a difference always to be forgotten when danger threatens.

The recent Chicago Convention of the Labor Party was attended by a thousand delegates from thirty-four states. The Gompers opposition to an independent labor party held the labor hierarchy in line but could not prevent a convention of rank and file workers. Also they were Americans and not "foreigners." A *bona fide* Labor Party was organized with this for its keynote, "Labor is the primary and just basis for political responsibility and power. It is not merely the right but the duty of the workers by hand or brain to form themselves into a political party." The Chicago platform is perhaps overly long. It embodies almost all the specific reforms urged by radicals. It demands amnesty, endorses the nationalization "of all industries which require large scale production and which are in reality on a non-competitive basis." It urges a league of the workers of all nations "pledged and organized to enforce the destruction of autocracy, militarism and economic imperialism throughout the world and to bring about world-wide disarmament and open diplomacy."

In sharp contrast to this lengthy and detailed platform stand the three planks adopted by the St. Louis Convention of the Committee of Forty-eight. They deserve quotation in full:

Public ownership of transportation, including stock yards, large abattoirs, grain elevators, terminal warehouses, pipe lines and tanks. Public ownership of other public utilities and of the principal natural resources, such as coal, oil, natural gas, mineral deposits, large water powers and large commercial lumber tracts.

No land (including natural resources) and no patents be held out of use for speculation to aid monopoly. We favor taxes to force idle land into use.

Equal economic, political and legal rights for all, irrespective of sex or color. The immediate and absolute restoration of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly, and all civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. We demand the abolition of injunctions in labor cases. We endorse the effort of labor to share in the management of industry and labor's right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing.

In addition the St. Louis Convention adopted certain resolutions in favor of amnesty, the lifting of the Russian blockade and other urgent matters.

The delegates showed both insight into reality and political sagacity in putting their platform in such brief compass and in concentrating on fundamental economic issues rather than on miscellaneous reforms. In our opinion, however, it is a serious omission that the first plank contains no reference to democratic management, without which public ownership may easily become bureaucratic and tyrannous. We had thought the war had shown the danger of the deification of the political state; a danger which we fear the Committee of Forty-eight has overlooked. It is significant that the Convention which adopted these planks had nothing more decisive to say against conscription than that it was opposed to universal military training and service "except in time of war."

The Committee of Forty-eight represents farmers and the middle class rather than labor, and its intellectual background is liberal, progressive and single-tax rather than Socialist. It is already doing a great educational work with an almost religious enthusiasm, and if it can perfect some sort of actual union or working agreement with the Labor Party and possibly also with the Non-partisan League, the coalition may become an immediate political force. Surely the times are ripe for the appearance in America of a strong party held together by some other principle than a desire for office and serving other interests than those which finance its campaign. There is a large body of labor and middle class opinion in this country which is not yet willing explicitly to endorse any thoroughgoing radical philosophy but which is thoroughly disgusted with the old line parties. Even though the immediate success of this new liberal and labor coalition may not be great, it must be remembered that the effort of radicals and liberals to formulate economic and political creeds is having an educative influence even upon the mandarins of the A. F. of L. Mr. Gompers hates the idea of a labor party almost as much as he hates the Socialists and I. W. W., but within the past month he has been compelled to call a labor conference in Washington, which having duly anathematized all radicals, itself adopted a program which is at least class-conscious enough to make the New York *Times* decidedly nervous.

The Convention of Farmers' Organizations which met at the same time at the national capital showed tendencies distinctly unfriendly to the packers and other big monopolies. At its close representatives of certain farmers' organizations united with certain labor groups in demanding that government control of railroads be continued and the Cummins bill defeated. Perhaps immediate progress is to come through this sort of pressure on the old parties and through industrial action rather than directly through any new party. At any rate the day of the economic imperialists may be shorter lived than we had dared to hope.

N. T.

The Legality of the Left-Wing Doctrines

By WALTER NELLES

A New York Magistrate has lately held that assent to the Manifesto of the so-called Left Wing of the Socialist Party (which became the basis for the platforms of both the Communist and Communist Labor Parties) in itself constitutes criminal anarchy. We welcome this opportunity to present a contrary legal opinion.

THE TEXT of the Manifesto of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party avows an intention to destroy the "capitalist state." True. It expresses no intention of destroying any persons or of resorting to any violence. The proletarian state which it hopes to build is in no way inconsistent with the continued existence of individuals who are not proletarian under the existing order. It does not contemplate that they should perish along with the capitalist society in which they now function; on the contrary, according to James Larkin, when their present activities are ended "they naturally will have to go to work the same as the rest of us." In other words, the conception of the proletarian state involves not the extinction of non-proletarians but the transformation of their activities. It proposes that productive service in some capacity shall completely supersede ownership of property as the key to opportunities of welfare.

The establishment and operation of such a state of course implies coercion,—of conduct, not of opinions. All government implies coercion. Recognition of the necessity and the expediency of coercion by majorities is the difference between believers in government and anarchists.

The conception of the proletarian state does not imply coercion of the majority. It assumes that the majority is in the nature of things proletarian. The only persons to be coerced are the minority who depend at present for their well-being, not upon constructive service but upon ownership of property.

The Left Wing Manifesto expresses no abhorrence of parliamentary action. On the contrary, it wishes to see Socialist officials in power. It is, however, strongly skeptical of the efficacy of parliamentarianism. It is skeptical because it conceives that parliamentary action is based upon an artificial system of representation—that the theory of representation by geographical units according to population results in fact in leaving the most numerous economic groups entirely unrepresented as to their economic interests.

It proposes as more effective than parliamentary

action what it calls "mass action"—that is, refusal by the organized proletariat to function industrially in the existing society. In other words, the strike for political ends. This no law forbids. The theory of the manifesto is that if the workers refuse to function the capitalists will be unable to function. The result would be that, rather than permit an indefinite disuse of the sources and means of production, some agreement would be reached for communal use and operation.

With the practicality or impracticality of this program we are not concerned. We are not concerned with its wisdom or unwisdom. We are concerned only with the question whether it is criminal anarchy; whether persons have a right to speak it freely without being adjudged criminals. It does not contemplate doing away with organized government. It does not advocate the use of force and violence. It does not advocate the employment of unlawful means. If it is impractical, if it will not stand the test of the judgment of time, there need be no fear that it will prevail. Only the hysteria of oppression and persecution can make it dangerous, not its free expression before the tribunal of sober public opinion.

America's Shame

IN THE UNITED STATES, from January 1st to December 17th, 1919, there have been 76 known lynchings,—70 colored, 4 white and 2 Mexican. Ten of the victims were burned alive and three were burned after death. In 1918 there were 67 lynchings—63 colored and four white. The figures for 1919 do not include the lives lost in the race riots in Washington, Chicago, Omaha, Knoxville and Arkansas. The continuance of this horror poisons our whole national life and silences our voice in the councils of humanity.

The Last Page

General Wood, I see, is a hot favorite for the Presidency, and the Germans are talking of electing General Hindenburg to rule over them; in France, General Foch is to enter the Senate, and a military dictatorship is said to be imminent in Italy. Well, this need not surprise us—after all it is only as if the bruised and broken world were applying to its wounds the old cure of a few hairs of the dog that bit it.

I like to speculate on the possibilities of General Wood's victory at the polls. What a cabinet he will be able to give us! I can see in my mind's eye the chosen rough riders of the nation galloping up to the White House to bring to the gallant General the benefit of their wisdom and experience. As the new Vice-President how appropriate Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Junior, would be; and as Secretary of War Sergeant Guy Empey would have a great opportunity to live up to his motto "Treat 'em rough." Ole Hanson, the saviour of Seattle, would do well as Secretary of State, and Newell Dwight Hillis would feel at home as Secretary of Navy, having been so often at sea in the past. The Hon. James M. Beck, whose patriotic writings have made him pre-eminent among producers of second-class mail matter, would excel at the Post Office. Judge Gary, as Secretary of Labor, would soon be as popular with the workers of the whole nation as he is now with his own employees in Pittsburgh. The Rev. Lyman Abbott, because of his patriotic yet Christian outlook, deserves a place at the General's staff, so also does Governor Coolidge, if he could be persuaded to leave Massachusetts to its fate. Archibald Stevenson (author of the famous movie serial "Raiding the Reds") is obviously the man for the Department of Justice. Perhaps as a measure of national economy and to mark the new President's sense of the need for drastic measures of reconstruction, the Departments of Agriculture, the Interior and Commerce might be rolled into one and placed under the care of Franklin D. D'Olier, the National Commander of the American Legion, who, with the aid of the chiefs of his great organization, would be well able to handle any jobs that might be consigned to him. On the other hand, I imagine, a new cabinet office will be created, a Department for Intervention, —for this Consul Jenkins is the man of destiny.

With such men in command, America will indeed be the land of the brave, if not the home of the free.

What forms shall our war memorials take? That is the question our journalists are discussing for us these days. Over in England public opinion seems to have taken up the matter with unusual determination and to have settled it pretty decisively, without the aid of officials and experts.

In London, on the eve of the Victory Parade in July, the authorities decided to put up as a memorial to the dead a temporary structure, designed by a distinguished artist, Sir Edward Lutyens,—just a plain, high altar made of wood and stone. It was erected hastily at the eleventh hour to receive the salute of the marching troops of all the Allied nations. And now a strange thing has happened. By the salute of those surviving comrades, by the gaze of a host of lovers and by the tears that have hidden it from their sight, by the flowers and green leaves that have been laid day after day at its base, by all the tender memories it has quickened, this stone of remembrance in White-

hall has become a holy symbol to the English people, sacred beyond all others to their ancient London.

When it was proposed to take down this temporary structure after the great Parade the papers were flooded with protests, and Parliament was petitioned against any such removal. The authorities soon yielded to this unusually vigorous expression of public feeling, and the Cenotaph, as it is called, is shortly to be erected in permanent form on the same site, with the hallowed temporary structure built within the new.

And this, significantly, is to be London's war memorial. No plunging figure of Victory, none of those horses who have never been known to stand on four legs in the presence of a sculptor, no angels, no tower mounting to high heaven, no heroics, simply a tall stone set in the midst of a busy street bearing only this inscription, "To the glorious dead."

It is a great relief to know that the patriotic auctioneers of America have decided, in conference assembled, to renounce forever the red flag so long associated with their profession. Henceforth a blue flag will make America safe for auctions. It is a relief also to hear that the Pope will not be giving any Red Hats to American church dignitaries this year. He has doubtless heard of the hyper-sensitiveness of American eyes to this bright color. But these cheering items of news do not touch a grave peril which stalks all unnoticed in our midst. I refer to the continued use of the red flag by our roadmenders when they go about their business. I feel sure that some day terrible rioting and shooting will take place when one of these red flags catches the eyes of a 100 per cent Legionary, who being drafted too late to get over to save civilization on the Marne is determined to save it on the Hudson or the Charles or the Mississippi.

Consider for a moment the provocation at present endured by such a patriot. A street or highway gets out of repair. There are big holes here and there and mud and dirt accumulates. Traffic is impeded. Complaints are made not only by nearby residents but by all who have occasion to use the street. At last the authorities decide to act. Experts examine and report the need for radical treatment. The road must be rebuilt. Workmen appear on the scene, rough, illiterate fellows, few of them natives of the place. What do they do? They first take possession of the road, plant the red flag and declare "no thoroughfare." Some day this will appear to somebody to be very like a Proletarian Dictatorship, and trouble will ensue.

And yet it is only by these means that a new road can be made.

Who was that worthy citizen I wonder (he certainly was not one of those disloyal "Reds") who paid a fancy price, \$20.00 I think it was, for the privilege of possessing the wine glass out of which the Prince of Wales had drunk a cocktail on the occasion of H. R. H.'s recent visit to a country club near New York City? As Calverley says:

"A piece of orange peel, a stump of a cigar,
When trod on by a princely heel, how beautiful they
are!"

THE PROOFREADER.

The World Tomorrow

begins its third volume this month with an edition of 10,000 copies. Despite rising costs our price remains the same—ten cents a month, one dollar a year. This necessitates a compactly written magazine, small in size, and nothing but sheer merit with which to win a larger circulation. It is on this basis only that we ask each and every reader of this issue:

- 1—To get us new subscribers.
- 2—To send us names of friends to each of whom we may send a specimen copy.
- 3—To become a World Tomorrow Co-operator by contributing \$5.00 or more to our Guaranty and Development Fund. To all Co-operators we shall send an annual report, and from them we shall seek advice on certain matters of policy by occasional meetings in New York (and possibly in other centres), and by postal referendum.

N. B.—If you feel unable to make any contribution now but can pledge a future payment, payable at one time or in installments, let us hear from you just the same.

May we count on you to help us in 1920?

R. S. V. P.

For the Children of Austria and Germany

In response to our Christmas Appeal for the starving children of Austria and Germany, we have received up to the time of going to press (December 24th) in cash \$3,833.87. We are hopeful that the entire sum will be raised before the next issue of this magazine.

We wish that we could share with our readers, on the one hand, the new evidence that has lately reached us of the desperate need of the children, especially in Vienna; and on the other, the spirit which breathes through the letters which have accompanied the contributions that have come to us.

The list of contributors, recorded only to December 18th, follows (gifts received since that date will be acknowledged in our next issue):—

Anonymous \$15.52, Anonymous \$10.00, Anonymous \$1.00, Anonymous \$25.00, Anonymous \$25.00, Abbott, Inez L. \$2.00, Adler, Felix \$25.00, Austin, Katharine H. \$2.00, Barlach, Joseph \$5.00, Black, Helen \$5.00, Bliss, Laura N. \$20.00, Brewster, Alice D. \$3.00, Bride and Groom \$25.00, Brownell, Bertha L. \$5.00, Burt, Amy \$1.00, Calkins, Mary W. \$10.00, Campbell, Gertrude H. \$5.00, Chase, Florence A. \$10.00, Christie, Olivia L. \$5.00, Clark, Mrs. O. M. \$10.00, Clissold, C. W. \$5.00, Coc, George A. \$10.00, Coerr, R. L. \$2.00, Conklin, Jean \$10.00, Cummings, Mrs. \$10.00, Daniels, L. \$7.00, Dudley, Helena S. \$10.00, Editorial Board and Staff (total pledges \$500.00) \$156.00, F. P. \$25.00, Fests, Mrs. Geo. \$5.00, Fahnstoeck, Z. H. \$25.00, Flagg, Harry G. \$10.00, Franc, R. W. \$50.00, Friend \$100.00, Friend \$40.00, Friend \$50.00, Gennett, M. T. L. \$50.00, Gardiner, Robert H. \$10.00, General Ceramics Co. \$241.25, Goddard, Dwight \$25.00, Goodard, Alex. V. \$5.00, Gordon, Arthur H. \$10.00, Gruening, Geo. & Co. \$5.00, Hall, Adele P. \$5.00, Hamilton, Alice \$10.00, von Haritz, C. \$5.00, von Haritz, Mr. and Mrs. G. \$5.00, Hastings, M. L. and A. I. \$5.00, Henshaw, Rebekah, G. \$15.00, Hennessey, Joe \$5.00, Herkner, Anne \$10.00, Hess, Dorothea C. \$5.00, Hester, August \$5.00, Hirsch, Gertrude \$10.00, Hirsch, Mary B. \$25.00, Holmquist, Louise \$2.00, Hunter, Stanley A. \$4.00, Irons, G. Seidel \$5.00, Jacobelt, Cecile \$10.00, Jones, J. I. \$10.00, Keith, Harriet H. \$2.00, Kelley, Mary \$9.00, Keppeler, Clara L. \$100.00, Kessell-Christine \$50.00, Klee, Edwin L. \$5.00, Leber, Robert and Alma \$100.00, Link, Margaret M. \$10.00, Littrent, Mrs. Geo. \$1.00, Mack, Mrs. Leah \$2.25, Morrow, Nancy C. \$5.00, Nast, Albert J. \$10.00, Needles, C. Blanche \$5.00, Neff, C. A. \$10.00, Neidhard, Pauline L. \$50.00, North, George W. \$1.00, North, May L. \$50.00, Nye, Irene \$15.00, Pania, Fred \$5.00, Pareia, Mrs. John \$5.00, Parker, Mabel G. and Mother \$10.00, Pennypacker, Anna M. W. \$2.00, Percy, Mrs. M. C. \$5.00, Pettie, Julia \$5.00, Pettigall, H. C. \$25.00, Fridella, Alfred S. \$25.00, Rabner, Bertha \$15.00, Read, Gilbert \$50.00, Rettinger, Mr. and Mrs. \$50.00, Reynolds, Charles \$25.00, Richter, Gustave \$10.00, Roe, Jennie P. \$10.00, Reyer, Edward G. \$5.00, Rogers, Florence S. \$10.00, Sanford, Mary R. \$25.00, von Schack, Dr. \$25.00, Schimpf, Max \$25.00, Schwane, C. F. & Co. \$5.00, Scripture, Bertha \$25.00, Scripture, Mary J. \$25.00, Silver, Mrs. George S. \$10.00, Sloginsky, Marion C. \$5.00, Smith, Harriet M. \$10.00, Spicers, F. Guthrie \$10.00, Stone, Ethel G. \$2.00, Stright, C. B. \$5.00, Thomas, Mrs. Emma M. \$5.00, Thomas, Miriam S. \$1.00, Turner, Clara M. \$3.00, Turner, H. M. \$20.00, Vogler, J. J. \$5.00, Warren, Clifford P. \$15.00, Weber, Bertha \$2.00, Whitcomb, Camilla G. \$5.00, White, H. \$10.00, Whitney, Elsie Gibson \$5.00, Williams, Mrs. \$2.00, von Zachreuschen, A. \$5.00, Total, \$2,621.62.

A CHALLENGE TO STOCKHOLDERS

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 2

FEBRUARY 1920

10 Cents

THE PEACE OF PARIS AND THE YOUTH OF EUROPE

George D. Herron

FEAR, NOT FREEDOM, OUR REAL DANGER

George W. Anderson

PREPARING THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

Henry T. Hodgkin

WHAT EVERY WARDEN KNOWS

Winthrop D. Lane

CO-OPERATION IN AN AMERICAN FEUDAL FIEF

Peter James Warbasse

WHAT ARE REFORMERS DOING IN EDUCATION?

Ruth McIntire

THE TRAGEDY OF THE LATIN AMERICAN PROLETARIAN

G. Arbaiza

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 2

FEBRUARY, 1920

10 Cents

The Peace of Paris and the Youth of Europe

By GEORGE D. HERRON

By the kindness of the author and of his American publisher, Mr. Mitchell Kennerley, we are privileged to publish in two installments the opening chapter of Professor Herron's forthcoming book on European conditions. Professor Herron's zealous espousal of the Allied cause and his wide knowledge and experience of men and events during these tragic years give profound significance to his judgments on the war, the peace treaty, and his own part therein.

I.

WHEN the war came on, sweeping the nations into hell and wrecking the soul of man, it was as if an actual but insane Lucifer, outwitting God and capturing the power, had laid maniacal compulsion upon our humanity. Yet we assured ourselves his time would be brief. Catastrophe so complete, so inclusive; so destructive of all that both nature and man had dearly achieved; so full of every manner of torture and death and derangement; so consuming life's inner substance as well as its outer form;—such catastrophe must, we were certain, carry in itself its own early extinction; it would soon exhaust the power of the nations to continue it. So we counted the weeks till the war's conclusion.

But the calculated weeks grew into years of incalculable moral and material ruin. The miles and millions of the dead increased till we ceased to number them—till death seemed all that really lived. As we brooded over it all, trying to understand, hunting for hands able to keep the world from the pit and finding none, our anguish not only obsessed our souls and our speech, often excluding all else: it became so encompassing that the uprooted hills, the crazed waters and the shattered air, all seemed to share it. Yet it was a helpless anguish, ignorant and uncreating: it provided no healing for the wounded and dying nations: it held neither solution nor constraint for a world organized for murder. The murder marched on, multiplying its hosts, the woes that waited upon it multiplying also—until at last the power to think and the power to pity broke down. The will to kill or to let die had become so absorbing, the infidelity of nation to nation and of man to man so commonly accredited, the protesting sympathies of both societies and individuals so impotent, that the whole expanding horror, eating into

the very soul of things as its circles widened, simply mocked the mind's efforts either to penetrate or to reach round it. The mental apparatus and the emotional machinery were left without motivation—with neither achievement nor hope to keep them going. Imagination, its divine occupation derided, unable to purchase any good thing with its ancient wage, refused to work: and the heart, exhausted from long over-feeeling, benumbed by the futility of its ablest promptings, finally ceased to feel. Without the strange apathy which came narcotically upon the nations, the hearts and the minds of many had not endured.

Whence it seemed, as year by year the world the redder and more reasonless grew, that the ends of all evil were upon us. There could not be more of evil, we said, than what we had seen and done—than what we were seeing and doing. It might even be that we were workers and witnesses of the world's awful end. The total catastrophe indeed appeared, betimes, to pronounce the conclusion of the human experiment, its failure too sustained and too irreparable, too prolonged and too costly to heaven, for further toleration. It looked as if God had had enough of the base and bloody absurdity of man.

II.

Yet, potentially, a worse evil has come upon us. The Peace of Paris, were there no redemption from it, would prove a more infernal fall of man, a more desperate derangement, than the war. The treaties therein set forth, greedy and savage and lawless, overladen with dishonesties and evil complexities, and as crass as they are cruel, as ignorant as ravenous, as silly as they are shameless, investing primitive revenge with capitalist modernity and epitomizing the capitalist culmination at its worst, are the shabbiest dissemblances that shabby minds

ever essayed to impose upon or between nations. These are not peace,—these treaties of Paris; they are rather a pitiless provision for a military and predatory government of the world. They are pregnant with wars more destructive, both physically and spiritually, than history has yet registered, with the resultant prospect of a generation if not a century of Tartarean tortures for the whole family of man. Indeed, issuing from the betrayal of the faith of the peoples by the Conference, the times of universal terror and dementia are already setting in.

III.

But it is more than the faith of the peoples in itself which the conference has betrayed. That were treason enough, surely, dissipating as it did the immeasurable spiritual treasure which both groups of belligerents had heaped upon the Peace Table, besides quenching the hopes and ashing the altar fires of two thousand years. But what has been wrought, beyond all this, is the destruction of the indispensable basis of peace—the confidence of the peoples in each other. Out of their common cry for a mutual and federating understanding, out of their yearning for unity and fellowship, the Conference has created a world of division and contradiction, and has ensphered it in poisonous suspicion. No nation now trusts a present ally more than a former foe: mutual and hateful unbelief in one another prevails among all the tribes of men.

Even the desire for high renunciation and concordant action is vanishing. The peoples are no longer mooded, as they erstwhile were, for international comity and kindness; for a world confederate in a common good-will. The great body of conciliatory expectancy which had grown up about the principles enunciated by Mr. Wilson—and which principles the Conference professed as its reason for being—has by this same Conference been wounded to its death. No nation now believes in the utility of the ideal, in the attainability of collective righteousness, or in international brotherhood as a near possibility.

Furthermore, the Conference has destroyed what remained of popular faith in existing social control or political authority. By the wanton ignorance of their diplomacy, by their unbelief in the peoples, by the secrecy and cynicism of their procedure, the peace-makers have demonstrated the stark incompetence of the mere political mind for national or international interpretation and administration. They have equipped and universalized the feeling, already widely abroad, that the powers of government, as these are now constituted, are not only inadequate, not only partial to the powerful few, but parasitic and archaic as well, able to function only what is worst and defeat what is best in human relations and aspirations. If you get close to the peoples, you will find that they consider that Paris has let the secret out: they are awakening, they ominously believe, from the long hypnosis, the ancient spell, whereby the sheer might of possession has been able, in its own predacious interests, to govern and guide the human procession.

IV.

Yes, whether it be for good or for evil, whether it be justified or baseless, it is an unevadable fact that, as a result of the Conference, belief in the fraudulency and incompetency of current social and governmental organization is now generally and irrevocably active. Moreover, alas! though faith in the old world has gone, no uniting faith sufficient for the effecting of the new has yet appeared. And no uniting faith can arise in man at the present low level whereon the Conference has left him. Without some great spiritual influx, generating mankind anew, no salvation is near.

For the last and worst achievement of Paris is the debasement of mankind in its own estimation. When men consider their capacity for collective honesty and decency in the light of the Conference, then the sense of humanity as trustworthy or important, the reverence of one human group for another, vanishes in mutual and helpless self-loathing, if not in laughter that is at once piteous and perilous. No other historic assemblage, no other congeries of events, has rendered human life so discreditable a thing in its own eyes—has made man and his covenants so contemptible to himself. And his value daily lowers: man refuses to take shares in his own future. The word of a man, the word of a nation, has ceased to be coin in the human realm.

V.

Yet the peoples expected a world of fraternal peace, at least in outline, to issue from the deliberations and decisions of the Conference. They had faith, before the Conference killed it, that such a world was effectible. They were ready to go the whole way that led to it. But the business which the assembled mighty ones took upon themselves was that of preventing this effectuation. And this defeat of the world's desire was made easy—was indeed made inevitable—by the fact that the peoples were not really represented at Paris: they had no actual voice in the Conference. The official representatives, self-appointed or named by each other, had no contact with the real will or wish of their respective nations; nor had they the mental tendencies or the moral experience wherewith to make the contact. The peoples were as sheep without shepherds; for they who made themselves the official shepherds proved, when all was said and done, as men who either served the Ancient Appetites or knew not what they did or whither they went.

If he who was the Promethean exception to this characterization—if the one man to whom all the world then turned, upon whom the peoples waited as men had never waited upon man, had trusted them with the trust wherewith they trusted him, if he had only taken them into his confidence and openly appealed to them, if he had but accepted the divine challenge to rise to his appointed stature, he could have swung the world into a light that had never shone upon mortal policies and proceedings. Not since the sorry tale of man began to be told, has such power for good, for universal change upward,

been in the hands of the single mere man. And history presents no mortal tragedy comparable to the failure of this man to capitalize,—diplomatically and spiritually and at its full value,—the power so confidently and universally thrust upon him. Nor is the tragedy lessened by the fact—if we agree that it is a fact—that the fatal causes lay more in the men that failed him and the forces that fought against him than within himself. Neither is it lessened if we admit, if we even brutally declare, as well we may admit and declare, that not Woodrow Wilson, nor all the political prophets from Moses to Mazzini, had been wholly equal to the stupendous total of hypocrisy and treachery which conventionalized the proceedings of the Conference, and which made its last days a derision to gods, men and devils. Nor does the admission cancel the result that now the peoples, despairing and blackly distrustful, and the earth wet through and bitter with their tears, go leaderless and leaden-footed into the uncharted darkness.

VI.

Thus there are some who, though standing against the things done in Paris, and for the things left undone, yet feel heavily accountable. With such, though among the least, I belong—with them reduced to anguishing interrogation, and possibly to depthless remorse. I used all the small influences I could mobilize for bringing America into the war. Before that, I had somewhat participated, chiefly through friends, in preparing Italy to march with the Allies. Nor does it matter that my words and efforts counted for very little, or if they counted for nothing at all: I am as responsible as if I had contributed considerably to the Italian and American decisions for war.

I believed then—as I still believe—that the thing we call Germanism incarnated the evil forces of history, and conceived the assault which Germany made upon humanity as their culmination. A German world, as Germany was then minded, would have been a world in which the soul of man had ceased to exist: men would have become automata—things for the creation of things. It was better that our history should be wound up, that human life on this planet should cease, than that the world which Germany then purposed should come into being.

I urged Italy to war, because I wanted her, first of all, to be true to her own national soul—to her special inheritance of highest political ideals—and because I believed in Italy's good future in Europe; secondly, because without Italy's intervention, Germany early would have come to dominate Europe, Asia and Africa.

I wanted America to enter the war, because otherwise it seemed impossible that Germany should be defeated—that was the first reason. But there was a greater reason—a reason reaching beyond the mere military defeat of Germanism. I believed profoundly, indeed religiously, that America's participation in the war would so transmute its whole motivity and conclusion as to render it the last great

war, and, furthermore, compel its ultimatum in a world-society of free and uplifted nations. I knew the spirit of the young men of the great American Middle West: these believed themselves taking up arms to set a host of wrong things right, to clean up the world, and to make another such war impossible. The spirit of the first Crusaders was actually theirs, and they commonly came to Europe with the seal of a high consecration upon them.

VII.

Yet another responsibility is mine. During the months after America had entered the war, divers highly-placed Germans came knocking at my doors at Geneva, seeking to learn the mind of America about their conduct and country, and hoping for some word that would indicate a way of negotiation through American intervention. Although these came partly through my friendship with such men as Professors Foerster and Jaffé and Dr. Muehlton, they were chiefly inspired by the legend that I spoke the secret mind of the President—whom I had never seen, in fact, and between whom and myself no word had yet passed. But the legend—growing out of my earlier defence of America and the President in the European press—produced for me a somewhat unique opportunity for observing the workings of the German mind, and for watching and reporting the developing European situation. I also took it upon myself to try to put what we Americans call "the fear of God" into the German heart—to convince my German pilgrims that America meant war, and meant it to the overthrow of Germanism.

That was in the earlier days of these pilgrimages. Later,—and this is what so sternly concerns me now—I made these Germans really believe, as I myself really believed, that the Fourteen Points would be precisely applied, both as regarded Germany and as regarded Europe. Those whom I convinced thence convinced others of their countrymen. And this belief in the President's pronouncements as the assured and sovereign basis of peace, and in himself as their undefeatable and indeed providential guarantor—this belief, promulgated from other points of vantage as well as my own, came at last to permeate the German people.

Finally, it was this faith of the German people in the Fourteen Points and their author that wrought the defeat of the German armies in 1918. I would not subtract an iota from the glory immortally due unto France's great Christian soldier—among the rarest and purest of historic heroes. But, if the truth be told, it was the word of Woodrow Wilson that, inwardly overthrowing the German Empire, prepared the victory which accrued to the sword of Marshal Foch. Moreover, by the time the armistice was signed, the moral lordship of Wilson was supreme among the German tribes—if we except the older and smaller Prussia. There was a fortnight wherein our President could have done with Germany much of what he would. If he had gone among them, at least nine-tenths of the German peoples would have asked only to have him say what they should do. It was in the power of the Allies,

at that time—if not in the power of America alone—to have crowned the military victory with a new and spiritual motivation, with an actual democratic initiation, of the German Empire. That we did not do so, is one of the war's several tremendous tragedies of lost and irrecoverable opportunity.

VIII.

Nor was it only Germany that waited—waited more than they that wait for the morning—for salvation at our hands. The Austrians hailed with joy the expected "Wilson peace," and prayed for an American occupation and administration of their country. And though her sins were ancient and great and many, Austria was yet the seat of a people intellectually fair and fruitful, and precious to the future family of nations. Yet, behold! At first wantonly encouraged by the Entente and afterwards as wantonly abandoned, Austria today lies listlessly and tearlessly dying, too starved and too spent to care any more, bartering her beautiful garments to vulturous hordes for a last loaf of bread, and civilization made mightily the poorer by her madly-wrought miserable end. And even the Bulgarians,—who were far from being vanquished,—laid down their arms because they were persuaded that "the Wilson way" would be followed by the peace-makers. "Now that we have heard of the peace Wilson proposes," cried the Bulgarian soldiers to their officers, "we have no need to fight more: we will not fight more: we will not fight America: if you do not ask for peace on the day we have named, we shall march upon Sofia and from there make peace ourselves."

IX.

But lo! out of Paris has come the negation of all we confidently expected as the war's end and justification. Instead of the establishment of open or democratic diplomacy, diplomatic secrecy has been malignly and a hundred-fold multiplied. Where one secret treaty existed in 1914, scores of secret arrangements and understandings exist today—and not one of them to be relied upon overnight. If there were instances of international honor before 1914, there are none now. These three Old World continents are one monstrous weave of basest diplomatic duplicity and barter, net-work crossing net-work, and whole peoples daily sold back and forth for a farthing of advantage.

But even our first purpose in the war—that is, the military defeat of Germany—is far from fulfillment. I am not sure but that we shall see, two or three years hence if not sooner, that the victory belongs to an unredeemed Germany. The peace-makers have given it to her—not directly, but indirectly and more certainly—through the kind of treaties they have contrived.

For it is a Prussian peace Paris has imposed upon the world—a peace dependent upon military force—a peace that can only be maintained through converting Europe into a perpetual barracks. Not one settlement makes for else than corrupting intrigue and exterminative war. And, in the midst of the

armed camp which Europe now is, Germanism is increasingly having its way. Without an interior revolution, or without some extraordinary intervention, Germany, riding the reaction against the international anarchy which Paris has generated, will come back into power, re-organizing Europe and dividing Asia with Japan—or mayhap with a militarized China.

X.

Yet this is the lesser of the German evils coming out of Paris. The incalculably greater evil is the triumph of the former German mind over the world that fought the German armies. Granting we have defeated Germany militarily, Germany has conquered us morally. Our respective states, or those who govern them, have out-Prussianed Prussia in putting her political philosophy into practice. Indeed, it would seem as if the nations which were at war with Germany have descended into a deeper hell than that whence she emerged against them, so completely has she captured their mentality, so utterly overthrown whatever formerly obtained among them of truth or scruple or decency in public information, declaration or debate. With the result that, when judged by the light that shone upon our planet from Woodrow Wilson's first interpretation and motivation of the war, our humanity has never so failed to keep faith with itself, has never sunk so below the level of its knowledge of the right, as its common condition today implies.

XI.

Such is the work of the men who, with tremendous flaunting of cosmogonical banners, assembled themselves in Paris to make a new world. It is indeed a new world they have brought about—but with what quality of newness! No envy will ever follow them; neither, let us pray, will any emulation. The Conference,—a tawdry and tedious thing always, its reactions divided between boorish levity and abominable brutality, its speech and its actions destitute of even a suggestion of either spiritual or intellectual dignity in its supreme moments,—has assured for itself a lamentable place in history: it was the creation of darkness, it sat and wrought in darkness, and it is darkness and the works of darkness that have proceeded from its portals upon the peoples.

But, though the peace-makers precipitated the darkness, and by them comes the deep fall of man therein, not unto them belongs the first and the only guilt: we who converted our pacifist convictions into petitions to our respective countries to wage war—to wage war against Germany and for democracy—to wage war against war and for the society of nations—we bear a well-nigh insupportable burden of accountability. We are answerable to our day and to the human future, we are answerable to God and to our accusing souls, for that supreme betrayal of human opportunity, for that veritable tragedy of the heavens, which the Conference of Paris has enacted.

(The second part of Professor Herron's article will appear in our next issue.)

Views and Reviews

The Supreme Council Yields at Last

THE best news since the armistice is the announcement that the Supreme Council, recognizing the inevitable, has ordered the blockade of Russia to be raised. This decision is the more welcome because it comes close on the heels of the newspaper story that the members of the Council in conference with the heads of the British army and navy were discussing more effective means of waging war against the so-called Bolshevik menace—a menace which our editors would have us believe threatens the safety of such widely separated lands as Poland, and Japan, Finland, and India, to say nothing of the New York State Legislature.

The official statement that the arrangements for trading through the Russian Cooperative organizations "implies no change in the policies of the Allied governments toward Soviet Government," is a perfect sample of the diplomat's art of trying to save one's face. It will deceive nobody.—Lenin least of all. Lenin does not want formal recognition of his government so much as he wants opportunities for trade for his people. And now that the Soviet Government has apparently reached a friendly understanding with the cooperative societies, he is doubtless well content to have the Allies make use of this distinctly non-capitalistic agency. The facilities now granted to traders cannot long be restricted. Moreover, it is unthinkable that hostilities can continue against the Bolsheviks. Only in a Gilbert and Sullivan opera could one nation both trade and fight with another. As we have said in these pages again and again, if Bolshevism is to be conquered it must be met on the plane of ideas and with the hard facts of economic law.

What actually is meant by this simple order coming from a few men—practically self-appointed—sitting in Paris, that the blockade shall be lifted? First of all it means the salvation of millions of lives. It means release and opportunity to those dauntless masses of Russia who have held fast in the face of the cruel and futile attempt of the Allied Governments—our own as well as the rest—to starve them into submission. Many Americans will feel a personal sense of gratitude if by some plan for the relief of the starving people of Russia they can be given an opportunity to make partial atonement for the hideous crime that has been committed in their name. We look to the Friends Service Committee for early news of great and generous plans.

A Victory—but not for the Church

But why has the blockade been lifted? However great our satisfaction at the news, we who believe that the well-being of the world can be secured only by the substitution of processes of reason and goodwill for those of violence, are obliged to reflect sadly that Allied policy has changed, not because of the triumph of common sense or of humanity or of the Christian conscience voiced by the Christian Church, but simply and solely because Allied and American

effort to starve Bolshevism out of Russia has utterly failed. Not the practical good sense of Colonel Raymond Robbins and those who supported him, not the glimpses of the truth which occasionally filtered through into the pages of our newspapers and magazines, not the universal pity which Christian Churches profess to teach, availed to end the blockade. Let us be frank about it. The potent force that brought relief to Russia was the military success of the Soviet Government, and next to that, the power of organized labor in Italy, France, England.

What ought to have been done by our common humanity was achieved by military victory (albeit a victory in which propaganda played a unique and mighty part), and in consequence the task of those who would persuade men of the power and validity of the ideals of human brotherhood and of the coming of a Christian world is made infinitely harder.

They tell us when it is too late

NOW that the Kolchak Government has passed from a state of near collapse to one of complete dissolution we are beginning to hear the truth about the gallant Admiral and his colleagues. *Current History*, for January (that encyclopaedic monthly published by the *New York Times*), has a remarkably candid and informing article headed "Kolchak's Methods in Siberia—Terroristic nature of his military orders, a partial explanation of his reverses." It is unnecessary to recite here the evidence which *Current History* adduces. We are, alas, all too familiar with tales of atrocities to need to hear again how cruel men can be to their fellows. It is enough to point out that this ultra-conservative magazine fully confirms the charges previously made by liberal and radical critics of the Kolchak dictatorship. Yet it is this cabal of Czarist generals and pensioners, that the United States Government and the Allies have been supporting with supplies, money, and men, while denying even food or medicine to the people of Revolutionary Russia. And *The New York Times* and similar publications have dared to justify our Government's policy by regaling us with tales of the superior democracy and humanity of Kolchak's regime! Now that the Dictator of Omsk is hopelessly defeated, the newspapers can afford to tell us the truth. Would they have done as much had he been marching triumphantly into Moscow?

We do well to reflect on this question because so long as it is possible for financiers and government agents through their control of the press to make us believe that darkness is light and light darkness, we cannot hope for peace or for freedom.

Food for the Hungry of Every Land

ALL humane men agree that Congress ought, without delay (or at least as quickly as they voted for war), to grant the loan for \$150,000,000 requested by Secretary Glass and Mr. Hoover to fight the famine in Poland, Armenia and above all

in Austria. This will, of course, be supplementary to private charity, which will still be imperatively necessary in these countries, to say nothing of Germany and Hungary, for whom no public provision is asked by Mr. Hoover. Americans are a generous people and when they are aware that their fellow human beings in other lands are not merely hungry but starving, they will not desire to withhold a full measure of relief.

We do not care to believe that those public officials speak for the real heart of America who find it necessary to appeal for this loan primarily as a means to defeat Bolshevism. Secretary Baker paid no compliment to his hearers' wisdom and humanity by his argument that Poland is especially entitled to food relief because she is fighting the Bolsheviks and hence to feed her is "protecting civilization" rather than "following out a humanitarian impulse." Evidently Mr. Baker is not in the secrets of the Supreme Council at Paris or he might not have used this argument just a day or two before the Russian blockade was lifted and Poland herself officially requested to withdraw her troops from Russian territory! We ought indeed to feed Poland as we ought to feed Armenia, Hungary, Austria and Germany, but we ought to urge her not to make war but peace with a government which has shown itself so reasonable and just as Soviet Russia is in her relations with her Baltic neighbors.

The Barbed Wire Entanglements of "Peace"

OF the various suggestions for the economic reconstruction of Europe there is one of which little was heard—at least until the publication of Mr. Keynes' book—but which is more practicable, less open to criticism, and in the long run more perfectly adapted for the promotion of peace and good will than the rest. It is the formation of a free trade union of the European states.

We in America little appreciate the suffering caused by the artificial barriers to trade erected by custom duties and export embargoes by every one of the nations, new and old, great and small, upon the continent of Europe. It is doubtful whether the disarrangement of trade and industry produced by the breaking down of such a large economic unit as was Austria-Hungary, does not more than nullify in terms of general well being such gains as are made by the attempt to gratify the nationalistic aspirations of this mixed population. Self-determination of peoples must carry with it the removal of economic barriers if it is to be a blessing.

The London *Nation* in discussing this matter, describes the experiences of an Austrian merchant who went from Salzburg to Agram in Jugo-Slavia to buy food for his starving fellow townsmen. He found abundance of food but was faced with impossible export duties and was leaving the place in despair when he met the director of a local agricultural society who needed salt for the curing of his bacon. Salzburg produces salt and this chance encounter led to an arrangement for an exchange of Salzburg's salt for Agram's food on the basis of a mutual remittance of the duties, which otherwise would have effectively prevented any such exchange,

even though the consequence was actual starvation—as it is today in Vienna and many other cities in Central Europe. Of course there may be difficulties in the way of an European free trade union, but they are as nothing compared with the tragedy of continuing the economic war that has succeeded the military struggle.

The Peace Treaty versus Politics

PRESIDENT WILSON'S proposal to make the Peace Treaty a campaign issue has not, to put it mildly, been warmly welcomed. Such a plan would mean a delay of more than a year in coming to a decision. A referendum, of course, would be entirely proper, but taken under such circumstances the question would be inevitably confused with the multitude of issues that enter into a presidential contest.

In any event the controversy between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lodge curiously ignores the most serious problems of the Peace. Mr. Wilson holds to the Treaty as the hope of the world with pathetic insistence, when even the bankers realize that unless the economic terms of the Treaty can be modified Europe as we know it today is doomed. On the other hand, Mr. Lodge's reservations, with the possible exception of the one concerning Shantung, do not affect the moral obliquities and the economic travesties of the document. Mr. Lodge and his friends are in general inspired by an aggressive spirit of nationalism. A somewhat melancholy satisfaction may be derived from the fact that the Republican reservations will lessen the possibilities of harm from the Holy Alliance which calls itself a League of Nations. It is altogether to the good that the American people should not be so closely tied to the nationalistic and imperialistic strife of Europe as was proposed in Mr. Wilson's original plan. The less we have to do with underwriting the so-called Peace of Versailles the better.

But to stand aloof is at best a negative service. The voice of those who honestly desire the end of imperialism and the triumph of a true fraternity between all peoples is yet to be heard. Their forum, we believe, will not be in congressional or parliamentary halls so much as in the meeting places of the workers.

Does President Wilson Know?

NO one can feel other than profound regret for President Wilson's sickness and sympathy for him personally. But the present reticence as to his condition ought to continue no longer. To what extent is he functioning as president? It is apparent that for one reason or another he is letting his "Balkanized Cabinet," to use *The New Republic's* expressive phrase, go its several ways. His mind seems set on one thing and that is the adoption of the Peace Treaty practically unchanged. But does not his firmness on this point seem to be the obstinacy of a sick man rather than the resolute purpose of a strong leader? How much do his advisers and physicians permit him to know? We should rather believe him ignorant of, than indifferent to, the deportations, and sedition bills and the general hysteria

which has swept over the country and confused the processes of government. In either case the situation is serious and calls for immediate attention.

"Inimical to the State"

IT seems as though reaction overreached itself when the New York Assembly under the leadership of Speaker Sweet suspended five Socialist members at its opening session simply because they were members of a political party whose platform in the opinion of these opponents is "inimical to the state." So highhanded is this act, so fraught with danger to representative institutions, that old-fashioned Americanism too long silent, has found its voice at last. Governor Smith, Ex-Governor Whitman, such a conservative United States Senator as Harding of Ohio, twelve leading New York clergymen and a long list of distinguished citizens have made notable protests against the action of the Assembly. So also have the *New York World*, *The Evening Post*, *The Globe*, and several other papers. The city and state Bar Associations, led by Mr. Charles Evan Hughes, have also protested, and the former has appointed distinguished counsel to aid in the legal proceedings before the Committee appointed by Speaker Sweet to hear the charges against the Socialist Assemblymen.

It is to be hoped that the Assembly—bravely scoring any attempt to save its face—will reverse the folly of its first act by voting in overwhelming majority in favor of the right of people of New York Assembly districts to elect their own representatives without interference from such modern witch-finders as the Lusk Committee and Speaker Sweet. If, however, this intolerant reaction should be strong enough to triumph it will have done a great day's work for its own undoing. Beyond doubt the suspension of these five men has enormously aided Socialist propaganda and has strengthened the Socialist cause. Moreover, it has helped American liberalism to rediscover its own soul. The folly of Speaker Sweet and his fellow conspirators may make, not only for their own political destruction, but also for the recovery of the American people from the hysteria which has too long held sway over them.

Judge Gary and Louis XV

THE end of the steel strike has not received the attention it deserves. After a prolonged struggle in which the workers demonstrated remarkable and unexpected endurance and solidarity, they were compelled to go back with no concession won. On the face of things Judge Gary has achieved a complete victory, and the public, where it is not indifferent, is content. The fact that the Steel Corporation used the enormous power which its money and solidarity give it to defeat all collective bargaining—at the same time passing the cost of the struggle on to the consumer—does not in the least trouble those citizens who are so resentful when strikers try to use their organized power "to hold up the public." Yet, ethically, is not the act of men who seek redress of admitted grievances more defensible than that of the owners of the steel corporation who, because they have money and power and influence,

use them—at the public's expense—to deny to the workers even such elemental liberties as freedom to meet, and speak, and the basic right of collective bargaining?

But the complacent man in the street might not have been so indifferent had he realized that Judge Gary's victory over the strikers has sown broadcast in the heart of labor seeds of class bitterness, hate of the mighty corporation and of the government authorities, and a general distrust of orderly processes, which cannot but bring forth evil fruit hereafter. "After me the deluge," said Louis XV. Are our modern industrial kings imitating his example?

Sins of Omission

THE Interchurch World Movement recently held in Atlantic City a conference of ambitious purpose. Leaders of the principal Protestant denominations came together to survey the whole field of the churches' activities. Numerous reports of real value on many aspects of the problem were presented and discussed, but omissions from the program of urgent and vital questions brought serious disappointment to some of those most interested in the Movement. No word was said about the ethical problems of the peace; no plans were outlined to show how the churches might help to relieve the desperate suffering in Europe; no report was made of the churches' program in regard to industrial affairs. Nothing was heard from the committee of the Movement which tried to mediate in the recent Steel Strike. There was a time when the publication of this committee's report might have been a notable service to the cause of truth and fair play. Now it is too late.

The explanation for these omissions given us by some of the delegates is not reassuring for the future. The men nominally in control of the Movement, however high-minded and sincere, are compelled to think first not of the Commonwealth of God but of the interests of the organizations they serve. So long as Protestant churches make no contribution to the solution of those problems which most concern the conscience of mankind in this generation they will forfeit their claim to moral, intellectual and spiritual leadership in a world hungry for some way of salvation from its own follies and sins.

Good News from Arkansas

IN our December issue we called attention to the travesty on justice involved in the trials of certain Negroes for complicity in the race riots in Arkansas. Our readers will rejoice with us in the news that the state has taken a long step toward vindicating its good name. The Governor has granted an indefinite reprieve to those who have been sentenced to death and the Supreme Court is reviewing all the cases which were rushed through the lower courts with so little regard for the ordinary processes of justice. It is also an encouraging sign of a better feeling in America on the race problem that Congress is seriously considering Federal legislation for the prevention of lynching.

Fear, Not Freedom, Our Real Danger

By GEORGE W. ANDERSON

We are indebted to Judge Anderson for permission to publish here the report of his recent address to the Harvard Liberal Club in Boston.

IT is a fit and proper time for really liberal organizations of every kind to consider and discuss freedom of speech and the other great guarantees of liberty. It is a depressing, almost an appalling fact, that, as an aftermath of our "war to make the world safe for democracy," real democracy now seems unsafe in America. It is increasingly clear that America's loss of valuable lives and of money in this war was as nothing compared with her loss of moral, social, and political values.

I shall enter upon no accurate and detailed discussion of the constitutional limits of free speech. It may be desirable that a citizen, who is also a judge, should not allow his mind to crystallize on some of the finer shades of that question. But I do now want to voice a protest against the prevailing propaganda of fear and hysteria which has led to most of the present agitation concerning limiting the freedom of speech, hitherto, on practical grounds, exercised without much regard to constitutional or even proper legal limitations. We and our English brethren have been accustomed, and probably wisely, on grounds of expediency, to allow a freedom of speech plainly exceeding the constitutional limit. Now, most of the fear out of which perhaps dangerous limitations of this precious right are being advocated, is in my opinion almost groundless. Many—perhaps most—of the agitators for the suppression of the so-called "Red menace" are, I observe, the same individuals, or class of forces, that in the years '17 and '18 were frightening the community to death about pro-German plots. I want to say something about the pro-German plots and their danger to America.

I ought to know something about those plots. It was my duty to know as much as any man in New England could know. As United States Attorney from November, 1914, to October 15, 1917, I was charged with a large responsibility as to protecting this community from pro-German plots. In October, 1917, I went on the Interstate Commerce Commission; and was until the armistice in intimate personal association with the Attorney-General, and with the men charged with responsibility as to discovering, preventing, and punishing pro-German plots. What I now say I say entirely on my own responsibility, but I say it after exchanging views with many others having analogous responsibilities

during this war period. If in fact the pro-German plots were no adequate basis for public fear, and for legislative and official activities against the right of individual and social liberty, it is quite possible that "the Red menace," promoted in large part by the same notoriety-seeking individuals and newspapers, ought not to frighten us to death.

Now, I assert as my best judgment, grounded on the information that I can get, that *more than 99% of the advertised and reported pro-German plots never existed.* I think it is time that publicity was given to this view. I doubt the Red menace having more basis in fact than the pro-German peril. I assert the significant fact that many of the same persons and newspapers that were faking pro-German plots are now promoting "the Red Terror."

Let us stop being scared at our own shadows. It is a time for calmness, for critical and dispassionate search for truth, for facts. We are over-fed with alarming rumors and wild imaginings. One aspirant for high office issues a pamphlet wildly inquiring whether "America is worth saving." It is, and it is fairly safe; even if he is not elected to the office to which he aspires. There will be no sun-strokes in Massachusetts this month. There will be no Red revolution this year.

I cannot say there will not be some bomb-thrower. A fraction of 1% of the pro-German plots actually existed. There are Reds, probably there are dangerous Reds. But they are not half as dangerous as the prating pseudo-patriots who, under the guise of Americanism, are preaching murder, "shooting-at-sunrise," and to whom our church parlors and other public forums have hitherto been open.

President Hadley advocated some years ago social ostracism as the punishment for anti-social money-getting. Personally, I doubt the desirability of dealing by law with the pseudo-patriot orators who would murder by shooting first and have trials afterwards. But I do seriously suggest that the social ostracism that President Hadley advocated as to anti-social money-getters should be applied by our churches, clubs, and other public forums to the hypocritical and noisy un-Americans who in this community for some years have, unchecked, been advocating crime and violence.

Real Americans, men who believe in law, order, liberty, toleration of others' views on political and religious subjects, are not given to advertising them-

selves and their patriotism. They have too much respect for Americanism and for patriotism to disgrace these fine words as they are being daily disgraced by those using them for personal or political notoriety, or even in some instances, as weapons in industrial conflicts.

The heresy-hunter has throughout history been one of the meanest of men. It is time that we had freedom of speech for the just contempt that every wholesome-minded citizen has and should have for the pretentious, noisy heresy-hunter of these hysterical times.

There is But One Agitator—Injustice

WE urge those liberals who are aroused over the situation in the state legislature at Albany to go further in their effort to restore civil liberty to the American people. The Albany inquisition would have been impossible had not previous assaults on the most elemental conception of democracy been allowed to pass virtually unnoticed by the very men and women who ought to have had a truer sense of the duties of citizenship.

What our country needs is a new and penetrating realization of the fact that the preservation of democratic methods of social adjustment is the only safeguard against violent and bloody attempts at revolution. The preservation of democratic methods means (1) the right of every man to express his views on political and economic subjects and (2) the right of the people to choose in orderly fashion, their own representatives.

These simple rights are flatly denied not only by recent events at Albany but by the sustained refusal to allow Victor Berger to take his seat in Congress. They are denied no less by the deportations, the sedition bills now before Congress, and the growing number of political prisoners in our jails. Only the other day in Utica, New York, three socialists of Syracuse were sentenced under the Espionage law to eighteen months imprisonment for giving out leaflets advocating amnesty for political prisoners and calling a meeting of protest. These leaflets published, be it remembered, months after the end of the war, contained nothing worse than an indictment of the way in which our political prisoners are being treated in our prisons. But so far no liberals have raised their voice in protest against this iniquity.

Perhaps the liberal's reply is that the cases we have cited are by no means on all fours with those of the Socialist Assemblymen; that Victor Berger for example is denied his seat not as a socialist, but as a disloyalist convicted under the Espionage Act. Let us see. His conviction is not yet confirmed by the Supreme Court, it was secured in a time of abnormal excitement under a peculiarly drastic law. Nothing save the expression of opinion was involved. In England, France or Italy as a matter of course Berger, if convicted, would long since have received an amnesty. All the facts in the Berger case were known to his constituency who had themselves loyally supported the draft law, purchased Liberty Bonds and aided Red Cross Drives. They have elected him not once but twice, the second time by an increased majority.

Liberals proclaim as their creed the doctrine that any change may be advocated so long as no violence

is used to effect it. This they say is "Americanism" as distinct from "Bolshevism." What do they suppose the Milwaukee voters, who are now taxed without representation, think of the distinction? Democratic government in times when fundamental political and economic matters are in debate means, if it means anything at all, that extreme minority opinion even though quite distasteful to the majority must be represented. To refuse to seat Berger (who by the way is a very moderate sort of socialist) is simply to invite "direct action" which in time may become revolution.

Such an attitude towards anti-war socialists would be inconceivable not only in a republic like France but in a monarchy like Italy where the conservative coalition has not dared to refuse seats to avowed revolutionaries, who openly profess their intention to abolish both the monarchy and parliament itself. Do American liberals desire to encourage the growing idea that there is in this country no real faith in democracy but that the ruling classes when their power is attacked will always go as far as they dare in crushing opposition? This is, of course, precisely the charge which Lenin brings against us.

None of these recent attacks on our liberties has involved more suffering and more injustice than the recent reckless deportations of aliens. Under our present law aliens can be deported for mere belief in "anarchy"—Tolstoi for example would certainly have come under the ban—or for membership in or affiliation with "any organization that entertains or teaches disbelief in or opposition to all organized government." The immigration bureau is sheriff, prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner. Only in extreme cases can the alien get before a properly constituted court by *habeas corpus* proceedings. Recent raids have been carried out brutally whatever Secretary Wilson may say to the contrary. Men have been held and deported on the flimsiest evidence with no proof that even theoretically they believed in violence, not even in retaliation for violence applied to them. Families have been broken up and many wives and children left (so far as the Government is concerned) to starve. This simple statement of fact condemns our whole policy.

Any attempt to justify it usually stresses the fact that these aliens belong to organizations believing in force and violence. The reason is specious. The Communist party platform for example, whatever else may be said of its form and content, nowhere specifically advocates armed revolution. Doubtless

many members of the party (like the signers of the Declaration of Independence) believe that violent revolution may sometimes be necessary. So do some people believe that war with England or Japan or Soviet Russia or Mexico is inevitable—or even desirable, but no one dreams it would help matters to deport or imprison this sort of "agitator" against our peace.

Laws may rightly deal with cases of actual violence or with specific exhortations to definite and concrete acts of violence—but that is all. On this theory of law some of our "patriots" would be under indictment sooner than any "reds."

What "red" has gone so far in the advocacy of violence as Secretary of State Langtry of Massachusetts, the state of "law and order?" He is quoted as saying to a church audience

"If I had my way I would take them (the 'reds') out in the yard every morning and shoot them, and the next day would have a trial to see whether they were guilty."

What is this but subversive of law and order? But its cure will not be accomplished by deportation or

or imprisonment. It is both unjust and stupid to deal by deportation or by drastic sedition legislation with the fire-eating revolutionary as we do not dream of dealing with the fire-eating reactionary.

After all, what can be more ridiculous than this anti-red hysteria? Had we a sense of humor the spectacle of our great nation panic stricken at a handful of reds neither numerous or powerful enough to start a first class riot (even if they so desired) would arouse inextinguishable laughter.

It is easy to see why ambitious politicians who have no constructive programs to offer, delight to play upon popular hysteria; it is even easier to understand why certain profiteers eagerly seek to distract popular attention from the reality of their own misdeeds to the bogey of a red peril; it is hard to understand why the people themselves should countenance this intolerance.

If there is any real danger of violent revolution let us remember that it can never be checked by coercing "agitators." Sir Charles Napier read history aright when he said, "Idiot talk of agitators; there is but one—justice."

Preparing the Christian Revolution

By HENRY T. HODGKIN

A SOMEWHAT curious thing has happened in the Christian peace movement. Men and women, whose one point of contact seemed to be that they were united in opposing war as entirely contrary to the mind of Christ, have discovered themselves to be united in a far wider range of subjects, and at a much deeper level. Beginning as pacifists, they have become revolutionaries. What is the reason of this development?

The war clearly showed the weakness of nearly all pre-war pacifism. It was largely based upon sentiment, and had not reached any well-thought-out philosophy of life. When, in each country, very strong arguments for war were advanced, and it appeared as if the causes of truth and liberty, and the very existence of the country, were at stake, almost every peace organization broke into two parties. The majority felt it incumbent upon them to fight: the minority (without being able, in many cases, to say why) felt that, even for so good a cause they dare not slay their fellows. We hold that this was a true instinct, but that it needs to be more than that. A true philosophy was needed to support it. In seeking for and discovering that philosophy, the Christian pacifist has become a Christian revolutionary.

The philosophy included three fundamental conceptions:

(1) *The absolute worth of every person.* War was seen to be wrong because men were treated as

means, and not as ends in themselves, and because it was inconsistent with the full development of human personality.

(2) *The universality of Christianity.* It was clearly seen that the Christian faith implied a unity of all men and women in one family, that, therefore, they were united in one common life, and that their deepest interests were the same. War assumed a difference that was not true to actual fact.

(3) *The means used in reaching an ideal must be consistent with the end in view.* It became ever clearer, as the war proceeded, that peace and freedom were not to be won by coercive means, and that the higher the end the more disastrous was it to use means inconsistent with it. The Christian pacifist must see the end so clearly that he will be able to choose the appropriate means. War to end war is a contradiction in terms.

Having seen how far the Christian protest against war carried us, we were compelled further to face our relation to the State which called us into war, to private property for the interests of which wars are commonly waged, and to that theology which cast a cloak of respectability over war, and bade men do evil that good might come.

In regard to the first, we were compelled quite frankly to protest against any idea of the authority of the State, which deprived men of full liberty of conscience, or which implied an obligation on the individual to do or be less than his best because he

lived in a community that had not yet seen that best as a worthy and realizable aim. State organization has a value only so long as it rests upon free personalities, uniting them in willing cooperation. So long as the individual is crushed, or persuaded to lower his own standard of right, in the supposed interests of the State, there is a wrong relation between State and individual. The Christian pacifist becomes potentially a revolutionary towards any such State.

In regard to property, it becomes clear, as we think of it, that the power to dominate men's lives, which comes through the possession of great wealth, is also a menace to freedom. Wars are often fought not for freedom of personality, but for the freedom of the capitalist to exploit and grow richer. Defence of property looms much larger than defence of person. The interests of property divide men, while the interests of personality unite men. Thus the Christian pacifist becomes, in relation to property also, a potential revolutionary.

In theology the conception of a God who is primarily interested in abstract justice, and who punishes men and nations relentlessly in order to establish it, breaks down before the idea of a God whose chief interest is to create right-thinking and right-living persons, and who seeks to do that only by the might of forgiving and redeeming love. This is the God revealed perfectly in Jesus Christ. His death is no longer to be seen as the price paid to an angry God, but as the supreme effort of the Father's love, shown in an acceptance of all the risks of loving even in a world where hate seems to rule. The tragedy and the glory of the Cross are seen to be the magnitude of the selfishness of men, which, unrestrained, must always lead to such results, and the undiscourageable nature of true love, which always forgives, and never fails. The Christian pacifist therefore became a revolutionary in relation to a great deal of current theology, and in relation to organized Christianity so far as it accepted and preached that theology.

As no one seemed to be standing for these things, and to accept this revolutionary ideal in its entirety, the groups of Christian pacifists were led to concentrate increasingly upon this body of thought, and to emphasize not simply their attitude to war, important as that still is, but even more strongly their attitude toward life. Doing this, we feel that we have a philosophy that will stand the strain of the next war. Such Christian pacifist movements as stand on this truth need not fear being split into warring sections when the next war comes.

Seeing the causes of war in false ideas of the State, of property, of God, and in the selfishness and narrowmindedness that embody these ideas, the Christian pacifist movement must become revolu-

tionary, and must seek for the revaluation of life that will lead to revolution. Just as war fails to bring peace, so will violence fail to bring the new order we seek. If we are to get not the appearance of peace but the thing itself, we need an outbreak of constructive goodwill. Love alone can create peace. So, if we are to get not the mere form of a new world, but the true social order in which service freely rendered by all shall be the prevailing spirit, we need not the destructive violence of an embittered crowd, but the constructive thought and activity of persons acting together in love. Love alone can create social justice.

So the programme of reconciliation proceeds from a deep sense of wrong—our own wrongdoing, as well as that of others. The capitalist and the revolutionary each assumes that he is right in the class war. While the Christian revolutionary is convinced that fundamental changes are needed, he can, for himself, only say, "I, too, am wrong." He begins by seeking for himself that true adjustment of life that makes him a creative centre for the new order. To both sides of the struggle he can come humbly, yet with a message of renewal. For himself he must take the highest course he can see, even if, in doing so, he seems to cut himself off from the State. He must discover the best means to express his social faith, whatever the cost to his comfort or safety. He must allow that thought of God which is for him central and regulative to express itself in all his life, even though this means that in himself a revolution must be started. Only those who have experienced such a revolution can be leaders of the Christian revolution.

Through some such process, then, many who began simply as Christian pacifists have been led, step by step, until they could only logically accept the full implications of their faith by taking not simply the title of pacifist but also that of revolutionary. The great needs of the world to-day are peace and a new social order. Those in whose hearts these two ideals are one, because of a deep philosophy of life that grips them and shapes all their actions—these are they who should be the healers and leaders of the world in its sore need today.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

GEORGE D. HERRON, well known as writer and lecturer, was chosen by President Wilson to attend the abortive conference with the Bolsheviks at Prinkipo.

GEORGE W. ANDERSON is Judge of the U. S. Circuit Court, Boston, Mass.

HENRY T. HODGKIN is chairman of the English Fellowship of Reconciliation.

RUTH MCINTIRE was formerly associated with the National Child Labor Committee.

WINTHEROP D. LANE is one of the editors of THE SURVEY.

JAMES PETER WARRASSE is President of the Cooperative League of America.

G. ARRAIZA, a graduate of the University of Lima, Peru, and formerly a journalist in Buenos Aires.

Looking Ruin in the Face

IN spite of the all we have read in the papers it is difficult for us in America to realize how terrible are the physical and spiritual conditions in Europe today. The most recent and authoritative analysis of the situation is to be found in Maynard Keynes' "Economic Consequences of the Peace," whose most significant chapters have been published in recent issues of *The New Republic*. Mr. Keynes, a distinguished professor of economics at Cambridge University, was the principal representative of the British Treasury at the Paris Peace Conference. He writes of European conditions in a tone of almost unrelieved pessimism. He draws a picture of moral disintegration as well as of economic breakdown.

"An inefficient, unemployed, disorganized Europe faces us, torn by internal strife and internal hate, fighting, starving, pillaging, lying."

The elaborate industrial mechanism upon which the life of western Europe depends has gone.

"The significant features of the immediate situation can be grouped under three heads: first, the absolute falling off, for the time being, in Europe's internal productivity; second, the breakdown of transport and exchange by means of which its products could be conveyed where they were most wanted; and third, the inability of Europe to purchase its usual supplies from overseas."

The Great Settlement (how ironic is the name) has augmented these difficulties. Old established trade connections have been violently broken up. Each little new government has set up its own high tariff walls and its own embargoes against exports. Each new government faced with enormously difficult problems of taxation has copied its big neighbors (who are in the same plight) by issuing great quantities of paper money. The Paris Conference have driven Austria over the abyss into bankruptcy. Germany is about to follow her.

Mr. Keynes analyses the economic terms of the German treaty and shows that in the year 1936 she will in all probability owe her former enemies half as much again as the original indemnity because of the compounding of interest on the amount which she cannot pay within the stated period. In other words, Germany has engaged herself to hand over to the Allies the whole of her surplus production in perpetuity—"The most outrageous act of a cruel victor in civilized history."

Mr. Keynes also points out what is obvious when one stops to consider the matter, namely that the great inflation in the quantity of money and in credit and the consequent depreciation of purchasing power really confiscates property as inexorably as could any Bolshevik revolution. The farther this process is carried the more complete is the confiscation. If it goes far enough the bulk of the middle-class of the pre-war period will find no reason to resist a social revolution. They will have nothing left to fight for.

But there is this difference between Bolshevik expropriation and expropriation by governmental

inflation. In the former case, at least in theory, expropriation is for the benefit of society as a whole; in the latter case, a new class of capitalists is created, composed in part of speculators and in part of those whom Mr. Keynes calls

"The entrepreneur class of capitalists, that is to say, the active and constructive element in the whole capitalist society, who in a period of rapidly rising prices cannot help but get rich quick whether they wish it or desire it or not."

This is the class commonly called profiteers and the intense popular hatred of them is one cause of the universal social unrest.*

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE MAKES A BELATED APPEAL

This view of European conditions which we have thus briefly and inadequately summarized is obviously shared to a greater or less extent by such an authority as Mr. Hoover and by the bankers and economists of the Allied and neutral nations who signed the recent remarkable call for an international conference to discover and explore ways of lifting European industry to its feet. This new financial group proposes these remedies: First, a vigorous effort to be made by all governments to pay current expenses by taxation and thus to put a stop to inflation. Second, a speedy modification of the extreme economic demands upon Germany. The bankers are aware, at last, that (to quote their own words) "for the sake of their creditors and for the sake of the world, whose future social and economic development is involved, Germany and Austria cannot be rendered bankrupt." Third, an agreement on a plan whose fundamental principles they state, whereby "countries where trade balances and exchanges are favorable should make loans or grant long term credits for the financing of European reconstruction."

This means, in short, that the bankers are groping for some practicable device whereby the United States with some aid from England and neutral nations may safely finance Europe. Will they succeed? On the one hand a successful and constructive revolution in Western Europe seems at the moment unlikely. Such a revolution would have an Herculean task to perform in reorganizing the whole business of production. On the other hand it is a question whether European capitalism is not sick beyond help. Is it reasonable to believe that the same sort of governing classes which negotiated the impossible "peace" of Versailles are able, while yet there is time, to revise its conditions? Will the increasing jealousy between the Allies permit the unified action that is necessary? How long will the peoples remain patient under the enormous burden of debt which no system of loans, no matter how skillfully adjusted, can remove? Mr. Keynes points out in his book that there are few signs that the present system has wisdom or vitality

*Mr. Keynes' clear analysis of this situation will be found in *The New Republic* for January 14th.

sufficient for its own salvation. As he acutely observes, "Perhaps it is historically true that no order of society ever perishes save by its own hand."

But this is not all. Even if the present emergency can be tided over and capitalistic-imperialism again be made dominant in the affairs of men humanity will have found not life but death, for that system carries within itself those seeds of future war whose harvest is destruction.

THEY WILL NOT TAKE THIS MEDICINE

Mr. Keynes has a program that might help to avert such a disaster. He proposes, among other things, a great reduction in the German indemnity, an end of the enormous powers of the Reparation Commission, a European customs union, a new international loan, and a general cancellation of the debts the Allies owe to each other and to America. This country would of course make the chief sacrifice in thus renouncing a claim to ten billions of dollars. But while that sacrifice could be justified on the grounds of enlightened self-interest as well as of humanity, *provided that all nations, notably Great Britain and France, drop their militaristic and imperialistic programs*, it is inconceivable that America will consent to it. It is more Utopian to expect the nations to go as far as Mr. Keynes suggests than to expect them to go farther! The spiritual qualities, the revolution in the ideals and principles that guide conduct necessary for the carrying out of his proposals, would be more surely called forth by a more thorough-going plan than the one that he offers.

For example, international cooperation can hardly be secured, even from a standpoint of enlightened self-interest, if the internal affairs of every nation are carried on in accordance with the well known maxim, "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." Why should the people of America renounce ten billion dollars owed to them by other nations while they themselves still continue to pay a vast annual tribute to the private owners of national resources? What is really necessary is not tinkering here and there to make our present profiteering system work, but the establishment of the social order on the basis of new and finer motives, and of more rational economics.*

America has a peculiar responsibility in these matters. We are the world's great creditors. Here capitalism is still strong and powerful, strong enough perhaps to save the old order in Europe for a little while longer. No matter what order of society is established, American capital, or rather American goods, machinery, and the like, will be imperatively needed the world over. Lenin himself sees the necessity of making concessions to secure them. But the more money Europe owes to America, the more truly will America tend to dominate European affairs. Just as Republican France unhesitatingly supported the autocracy of

Russian Czarism for the loans, so the inevitable tendency of America to support the *status quo* to secure payment from her debtors, America's foreign policy will our financial future will be our stake in the game.

Still more immediate help as we may extend it will be used directly or indirectly by a big army and navy program. It is one thing to talk of the misery of Europe; it is another to maintain great armies of India, in Egypt, or in Syria, the secret machinations of the world.

WEIGHED AND FOUND

If America were informed of the needs of Europe, could make Europe's needs promote peace and fair play for American goods and American powers could not refuse reference on disarmament or Treaty, and the formation of nations.

But we are spiritually in crisis. We have come to the point where we can no longer not avail ourselves of the help of the world because of our ignorance, our faith. Instead of putting the task of ridding the world of our rulers and leaders of power by the hysteria of reaction, we face the fact which the bankers have ignored. They do not see the rehabilitation of war-torn spiritual problem. We must find, but beyond that there do. Mr. Keynes' conclusion

"For the immediate future and the near destiny of Europe will not be shaped by the hands of any man. The events will not be shaped by the delusion but by the hidden currents, by the surface of political history, but by the hidden currents, by the forces of instruction and in opinion. The assertion of illusion, the dissipation of instruction of men's hearts means."

"The real enemy of Christ is the Socialist but our industrial

"A policeman is paid a higher man's head than a teacher is intellect."

"The workers of the world are forced to the conclusion that is a fraud."

* Consider for example the irrationality of a system which constrains Danish farmers to ship butter to American markets when their next door neighbors are starving for such fats.

A Challenge

the protection of French
agency will be for Amer-
to in Europe, in order to
creditors. The more exten-
sions, the more reac-
interests become and the
the whole imperialistic

the danger that such
to England and France
indirectly to finance the
of their two govern-
lend money to end the
other thing to lend money
y makes it possible to
occupation in Ireland, in
a, and to finance all the
imperialist throughout

FUND WANTING

med and aroused, she
sity her opportunity to
y. So great is the need
merican credits that the
our invitation to a con-
for the revision of the
a of a real league of

prepared for the world's
his fateful day but can-
t opportunity it brings
selfishness, and lack of
their hands to the high
of war and imperialism,
public opinion are caught
at home. This is the
and economists have
that the problem of the
Europe is essentially a
t indeed feed the starv-
is little that loans can
n is inescapable:

events are taking charge,
ype is no longer in the
ents of the coming year
berate acts of statesmen,
owing continually beneath
ry, of which no one can
ay only can we influence
etting in motion those
agination which change
truth, the unveiling of
ate, the enlargement of
nd minds, must be the

N. T.

nity is not the sceptic or
ystem."

REV. DR. A. J. CARLYLE

wage for hitting an Irish-
paid for cultivating his
J. DEVLIN, M. P.

re being slowly but surely
Parliamentary Government
EXON HARTSHORN, M. P.

the "reddest" of
radicals who would
propose some form
of co-operation to
take the place of the present system.

In legal theory stockholders have well-
control over the industry in which they buy
stock whether by inheritance, by gambling
market, or by investment of hard-earned
money. Though this arbitrary power of ownership
of investors has been somewhat checked in
by the growing strength of organized labor

cases by legislation,
nevertheless power still
resides in property and
ownership rather than
in life and labor of hand
or brain. Can this situa-
tion be ethically justi-
fied?

Again there is the
question of profits and
their distribution to
stockholders. The re-
cent coal strike has
vividly illuminated this
aspect of the problem.
Men and women every-
where—not thousands
but millions of them—
are asking by what
moral right do private
owners of coal fields re-
ceive profits ranging,
according to Mr. Mc-
Adoo, as high as 2,000%
in 1917, and according
to Mr. Glass to 800% in
subsequent years—the
very years when sacri-
fice was urged upon us
all!

Every day our news-
papers tell of the mount-
ing profit of those who minister to our needs.
For example is the Cuba Cane Sugar
Company, showing for the year ending, September
30, 1919, an increase in operating profit over the previous
year of \$3,000,000, most of which is to go to shareholders
in the form of increased dividends,—and this in time of such
general distress. It is significant that in general more than

* Basil Manley former joint chairman of the
Board charges that in 1917, "nearly half of the
185 out of 404, actually earned profits on the
order of 100% to 7,836%." He also presen-
tation of gross profiteering in the wool, steel and pack-
age industries which concealed their real profits even from the

A D
We, the
bility as stock-
holders in the
our conviction

1. That
the adequacy
those engaged

2. That
should pass
who work

Insofar as
will use it
determination
working com-
we hold stock
support such
promote the
and of the
may mean
separate com-
pared to a
from this
the cooper

All who are
comment to
World Tomorrow

Stockholders

the income of residents of the United States is now derived not from

service rendered but from property owned.

Criticism of this system now rumbling round the world like thunder, is not silenced by saying that many investments result in loss and no profit, or by asserting that increased production (which assuredly our present system is not securing in satisfactory fashion) rather than more equitable distribution is the way of salvation. The ethical question still remains. To what extent, if

For Stockholders

a view of our responsibilities to our beneficiaries through the medium of the stockholder is being compelled to state

the industry should be able to provide compensation of

the control in industry is in the hands of capital to those who own it.

the power or influence we have is being put into effect in the industry concerning wages and the companies in which we invest. We will seek and find the solution of industry as will be found by both of the workers and the large, even though it is the disappearance of any other, and we are personally at loss as may arise from the organization. We invite the stockholders to this end.

the above statement or have the right to communicate with The

at all, are men justified in demanding dividends from an industry to which they make no direct and personal contribution? Do the social consequences of the present system constitute its adequate justification? Rather may not those critics of our social order be right who ascribe to the power and privilege inherent in absentee ownership a large part of the strife, the confusion, and the spiritual and artistic mediocrity of our present "civilization"?

But in fairness let it be said that the investor of money as an individual does not always deserve the denunciation which is heaped upon him in certain quarters. Although in theory he is absolute master, in practice he is usually well nigh powerless

to make any effective contribution to the problem of management. It is an ironical fact that it is the savings of the workers themselves, who ought to be most interested in the abolition of exploitation, which constitutes the kind of capital which the original investors can least control. The worker must provide for old age or for dependents. Except in the case of certain cooperative ventures, that means that he must invest in savings banks or insurance companies over whose use of his funds he has no power of direction. Once he has deposited his money his function has to all intents and purposes ended.

members of which regard to the moral code. Professor Vida Scuffia's suggestion that the suggestion that should be made for the desire to know those conditions to standards of hours.

These are all strains of a new wind. Another the recent declaration "We favor an equitable will have the right to profits," and of the "The laborers' right to a first moral charge" has a right to get business, but he has investment until his living wages." Surely the present social order only needs to be put to these cautious statements.

In England, too, has been started. A law signed a statement of claims of the workers.

Will not a similar mediate and general stockholders? Of course a few or many will remedy a tithe of the system or solve its problems but in these days even to end injustice is when to protest is a declaration that we are of the stirring of a new and an awakened sense of workers—a comradeship face personal sacrifice of such a spirit that those social changes, hearts to be inevitable violence and bloodshed.

With this high aim who are concerned in the industrial problem when in discussing, signing, set in the centre of the

* Something of the same less conservative an organization recently went so far as to list "a distinguishing mark of every British company disproportionate to its size. A particular suggestion was that labor was sweated

pledge themselves "to have re-character" of their investments. Odder, of Wellesley, has made a "white list" of corporations to the benefit of investors who de-corporations which best conform to wages and the like.*

laws which show the stirring of a significant sign of the times is one of the Methodist Bishops: a stable wage for laborers, which of way over rent, interest and the Catholic Bishops who said, it to a decent livelihood is the upon industry. The employer a reasonable living out of his no right to interest on his in-employees have obtained at least ly even those who believe that order is ethically justifiable and aged of abuses must agree with vents.

an interesting movement has ge body of shareholders have setting forth the paramount ers to the income of industry. movement meet with an im-pulse response among American course, no mere declaration by justice-loving shareholders can e ills of the present industrial multiple and complex problems. en to declare an honest desire something. These are times a constructive service. The propose will at least give proof ew spirit in the hearts of men use of comradeship with the ship which does not refuse to e. It is only by the extension we may reasonably hope to see which most men know in their e, brought about without gross ed.

in view will not our readers to this particular aspect of the welcome an opportunity to join and circulating the statement e preceding page.

me idea has been advocated by no en than the London Times which suggest that in the stock exchange rk should be appended to the name e paying a standard of wages not idents." The occasion of this par-strike in which it was discovered to provide 350% profit.

Saving the Children

The following account is from a letter from a friend in Holland, dated December 21st, 1919.

"Every week we send two trainloads of food to the starving people in Austria and Germany (matter where) twenty and thirty large wagons, and two wagons for the distribution of the food. They return with hundreds of children to stay two months in Holland as guests. We should see the children pile out of the trains and hear them. They come from Vienna and Budapest and other Austrian and Hungarian cities. 'Pathfinders', all lads, meet the children at the station with shouts and hurrahs and conduct them with pride to the various homes provided for them. The German trains arrive in the afternoon and sometimes see the children coming in. The girls are giggling—the boys look as if they were they had on those nice suits the 'pavinders', but they hold their heads up as their strength permits. The weak ones are brought in wagons and autos. What days for those little things to remember when they grow up. These trips to Holland will never be forgotten. The aid that Holland is giving to those starved out lands is marvelous. Holland has ever befriended the oppressed ever will."

In the "*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*" of December 14th, 1919. Professor Dr. Emil Abderhalden writes from Halle "The dark streets of Halle deserted. The lack of coal makes it impossible to light them. The clock strikes eleven. All sudden the lonely street becomes alive. Everywhere are grown-up people laden with cardboard boxes, knapsacks, etc., each leading a little child or lass by the hand, streaming towards the station. The children have labels hung on them. These are written the names of places: Berlin, Berne, Zurich, Davos, etc. Children's voices announce proudly that they are invited to be guests of friendly Swiss families."

In the station the little ones are all lined up. There is a final waving of hands to the parents and they climb into the special train waiting for them. There is no loud rejoicing, no boisterousness! The spirit of youth is lacking. Pale, hollow cheeked they sit there and discuss, with wisdom beyond their years, the condition of exchange and such like matters. Just as quiet parents turn back home.

Once again there is a concourse at the station. The parents form an impenetrable wall along the platform. They are expecting their children. Patiently and anxiously they wait, for the train is late. Suddenly there is a stir in the crowd. The train steams in. The whole station rings with rejoicing! Everywhere, wherever one looks, rosy cheeks and bright eyes. The eyes of the parents light up in their turn! Many hardly recognize their children again. There is a loud buzzing of talk. Happy hours again after all these years! Many a little one's life has been saved. How can it ever be possible to thank the self-sacrificing Swiss for what they have done."

What Are Reformers Doing in Education?

By RUTH McINTIRE

Every hope for a new world depends upon a development of finer human traits and of a sounder knowledge than we now possess. That is why it is so vital that as a nation and as individuals we should pay more diligent attention to the subject of education. The facts brought out in the following article call for deep concern.

THIS country has reached a crisis in education. It is realized now by the public as well as by the experts that something must be done to maintain America's reputation, but the concern is manifesting itself principally in plans for changes in university training, in technical and vocational instruction and in Americanization programs. It has yet to be generally realized that America's boast of "universal education, free to all," is today nothing but a boast and a tradition. The entire educational structure of the nation rests upon elementary education, and elementary education has broken down. The bearing of this matter upon our national life has been emphasized recently by the National Child Labor Committee in a statement saying, "The child labor problem can never be solved without recognizing the fact that the schools actually drive children into industry." This marks a definite step towards a frank acknowledgment that child labor is not exclusively a question of legislation but is primarily a question of child nature.

SOME APPALLING FACTS

In the matter of education the year 1918-19 proved the inadequacy of our schools both to hold the children and to hold the teachers. Schools in all parts of the country, particularly in the rural districts, closed for want of teachers. Forty thousand more teachers left the schools than in normal times. Classes were consolidated, imposing on the teachers who did remain an even greater burden than before, and an unprecedented number of those teaching were inexperienced. In New York City, in a single day, more than 30,000 children for whom there were class-rooms but no teachers were sent home without instruction. Recent figures, compiled by the National Education Association, indicate that "more than 100,000 teaching positions in the United States are either without teachers or else supplied with teachers who are admittedly unqualified to teach." The reason is to be found in the logical one of supply, demand, and wages. The salaries of teachers for work that demands the highest obtainable ability, training and personality are in general lower than those of clerks.

The United States Commissioner of Education, whom no one can accuse of radicalism, has stated that the salaries of teachers will have to be doubled.

But although the present value of the dollar relative to its value in 1914 is about 60 cents, only one of our large cities—Cincinnati—has raised its teachers' salaries in accordance. In fact, eleven cities of over 100,000 population have made no advance whatever in this respect.

In addition to the educational breakdown due to the teacher shortage, the schools are frequently quite incapable of holding the children in a physical sense. In New York alone there are now 232,347 children on part-time or double shift in the elementary schools. Thus nearly a quarter of a million children, or about one-fourth of the total school population of the city, are compelled by law to go to school and yet are not given facilities for a real education. No new schools have been opened, and the Work-study-Play plan which in thirty-three schools had helped to solve the problem of overcrowding, has been successfully "eliminated" and the children returned to a truncated school day. Judging from reports of other localities this situation is not peculiar to New York.

Small wonder, then, that one million American children between 14 and 16 years of age leave school every year. Small wonder that of the children leaving school to go to work, less than one-third are influenced by actual poverty. In this connection Bernard Shaw's recent words are to the point:

"When young people are as free to walk out of a classroom where they are bored by a dull teacher as grown-up people are to walk out of a theatre where they are bored by a dull playwright, the schools will be far more crowded than the theatres and the teachers far more popular than the actors."

The unwillingness of modern youth to embrace current educational methods results in the maintenance of expensive systems to gather in the numbers of children who will not voluntarily attend school. Added to this is the cost of maintaining truant and reform schools. What is more, it pays to become a truant. For in truant schools and nowhere else, except in certain modern private schools and in a few experimental schools, is the attempt so successfully carried out to educate the whole child by interesting him in a number of active pursuits. Thus the natural, selective function of the public school weeds out those youngsters who are more enterprising in their rebellion against the present

system, who are thereupon turned over to schools that to a greater degree fulfill the child's needs. One is impelled to wonder if it would not be more effective to begin by giving to *all* children the best features of these truant schools, evolved as they are from practical experience.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHILDREN'S CODES

But the present question is: in what way, if at all, are social workers trying to meet this primary educational problem? The greatest single advance is in the present agitation for children's codes—plans for the coordination and effective administration of all the laws relating to children within a given state. The relation may seem tenuous, for children's codes are subjects for legislatures; and legislation is notoriously inadequate in the supplying of children's needs. But through the adoption of children's codes in several states it appears that the limitations of law are being discovered, and an attitude created which will open the way for vitalized education.

Ohio appointed the first children's code commission in 1911, and two years later the legislature passed most of the measures recommended. New Hampshire and Minnesota followed two years later, succeeded by Kansas, Delaware, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and Connecticut. In 1918 Missouri's code commission published an exhaustive report after several years' study of the existing laws and their administration. Its object was to consider the whole child in matters of health, education, labor, and protection from neglect and crime. Its object was even more prevention than cure; thus for once, raising the practice of law-making from a haphazard avocation to a business-like effort based on actual conditions.

The most important feature of this development, however, is probably unrecognized by the majority of people working for the adoption of children's codes. The whole idea is impelling people to adopt a scientific habit of mind in dealing with all problems of this character. The arguing from cause to effect is implicit. If we allow the mating of defectives we must have institutions to care for their offspring. If we do not compel children to attend school there will be child labor whether the law forbids it or not. The relation between mothers' pensions and child labor is just as intimate, and between juvenile delinquency, education and child labor. These are now acknowledged facts. The next logical and inevitable step is the acknowledgment of the inner relation between education, that is *the kind of school*, and the child labor. This is crucial; it lies unconfessed behind all the current discussion of salaries, illiteracy and truancy. Unconfessed, unless, that is, there is confession in the

very term which we hear so often, "back-to-school drive."

Children can be *drawn* back to school only through the existence there of something that interests them more than employment. The connection between the public schools and certain features of modern industry is unavoidable. Exploitation is fundamentally a problem in lost identity and lack of opportunity. External circumstances may render the condition barely acceptable or unendurable as the case may be, but the situation always contains the germ of oppression. While protection is sought against the sacred right of employers to exploit or of children to exploit themselves, can we overlook the fact that the traditional school may achieve the same result by subjecting all children to one process and one curriculum, by robbing them of initiative, responsibility, and independence,—that it may turn them out into the world totally unfit for assuming responsibility, for choosing an occupation or for taking an intelligent interest in the art of living?

LET US RUN THE SCHOOLS IN THE INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN

The schools have not been run in the interest of the children any more than industry has been run in the interest of the workers, and as the industrial problem is being met in certain instances through the cooperative and responsible interest of workers in the organization and administration of the shops and factories, so we must finally arrive at the solution of the complex child-labor-education problem by means of a radical reorganization on the basis of the needs and interests of those affected.

This is all the more difficult to do because children are strangely inarticulate and submissive when it comes to expressed consciousness of their demands. But behind the annual exodus from school there lies a tremendous revolutionary force, becoming articulate only through action. And the exploiters of child labor who profit by this instinct are perhaps not more to blame than the public at large who continue to inflict a formalized type of instruction well calculated to reduce children to a common mold, ripe subjects for future exploitation of all kinds.

Paternalism is as misplaced here as in industry and government, and as opposed to our professed belief in democracy. Democracy in education means a willingness to be guided in our plans for children by their own unconscious, unexpressed needs. The final test of our purpose to destroy child labor lies in our willingness radically to alter the present school system in order to give scope to the vital impulses of childhood.

What Every Warden Knows

By WINTHROP D. LANE

WHAT has been the effect of imprisonment upon political offenders? Has it weakened their convictions? Have they yielded their opinions to the rigors of confinement, set an example of good conduct to their fellow inmates, or come forth worthier to be entrusted with the responsibilities and freedom of life in society?

Nearly everybody has been answering these questions but prison wardens. To them the receiving of such offenders has been a part of the day's business. They have regarded them as occupying for the most part the same status as other prisoners—as presenting the same problems of reformation and discipline. They have fed and clothed them, tried to assimilate them into the rest of the prison population, put them to work and sought to fit them into the administrative scheme generally. When punishment has been deemed necessary, they have deprived them of meals, taken away their letter-writing privileges, withheld their "good conduct time," sent them to solitary confinement for days or even weeks at a time, kept them on bread and water, handcuffed their wrists to the doors of their cells so that they were compelled to stand for eight or nine hours a day; in short, have subjected them to all the customary penalties of a repressive penology. But they have not—until quite recently—told us what effect all of this has had upon the prisoner himself.

What a terrible shock it must be to those who have participated in sending several thousand political offenders to prison during the past two and a half years, suddenly to be told that all of this time they have been violating the fundamental principles of American penology. What must the federal government think of its own wisdom when prison wardens—the very people who might be expected to agree with a policy of imprisonment—turn upon it and say that political offenders "may be wholly without criminal bent and intent"; that they cannot "be made subject to ordinary reformatory influences"; that "the grim steel-barred cell was not devised for their safe-keeping"; and that "their minds may be far beyond the reach of the elementary influences by which it is sought to reclaim the thief and the crackman." Surely these words will have a disquieting effect in quarters where it is assumed that prison sentences are the best antidote for all preaching of nonconformist doctrine.

These sentences are quoted from the report of a

special committee of the American Prison Association. This is the largest and most representative body of prison administrators in the country. The report of its special committee, read at the recent annual meeting in New York City, dealt with "Political Offenders and Their Status in Prison." The members of this committee have studied the prison problem closely; some of them have actually administered prisons for years. They were not interested in the political offender as such; they were not even interested in the rights of free conscience and free speech. They regarded the problem before them as purely penological. The fundamental principles of our penal system, they said, are two: first, the rehabilitation of the offender, and second, the protection of society in person and property. The commitment of men to jails and penitentiaries for political offenses, they declared, involves a denial of these principles because it "spells punishment minus reformation." And they continued:

"The man who risks conflict with drastic laws for a political conviction, no matter how mistaken he may be from our point of view, or who in obedience to dictates of his conscience refuses assent to service prescribed in times of stress for all alike—such a man, we may judge him harshly or leniently according to our standards, is a misfit in any prison. He may not disturb the routine of prison management and discipline, but meekly conform to all that is exacted from him and endure every hardship or deprivation without a murmur. Yet what impression does it leave on the minds of his fellow convicts to witness that the non-criminal is made to fare exactly as the human dregs adjudged guilty of the most revolting offenses? Does it serve to clarify their muddled notions of the meaning and purpose of imprisonment? The rigors to which he is subjected may break the body of a political offender, but is it recorded that his spirit has been tamed, that he has recanted because of the reformatory measures employed to teach him other concepts of the state and men's relation to it? One of our maxims is that mere punishment avails not in making straight-living men out of crooks, but what other significance than punishment has incarceration as a common felon in the case of the political offender? It is not by this means that entrance is made to the souls of men and acceptance gained for different ideals."

The committee did not criticize the laws under which political offenders have been condemned. Neither did they undertake to say what policy the government should adopt to protect itself or to safeguard administrative objects. Moreover, they distinguished between political offenders who have no purpose to commit crime, but who, because of technical violations of the law, are regarded as criminals, and those who, in furtherance of political objects, actually do commit crime and so enter the

ranks of "common misdemeanants or felons." With the second of these groups they said they had no concern. Neither were they interested in special leniency for political offenders. They said:

"When it becomes necessary for the safety of the state, that the political offender must be separated from his fellows, let him be so separated, but under conditions that deprive him of avoidable martyrdom and its dire consequences. This means that he should be set apart from the common herd of evil-doers."

To discuss in detail the kind and form of detention, said the committee, was not in place.

How far the committee's views may be the result of the actual behavior of political offenders in prison—of their "disturbance" to management and discipline hinted at in the quotation above—can only be guessed at. Certain it is that the commandants of our disciplinary barracks (military prisons) have at times wished themselves well rid of all conscientious objectors. When large numbers of such objectors were confined in solitary cells at Fort Leavenworth last winter for refusing to work, other objectors voluntarily brought this punishment upon themselves as a protest against such treatment, so that for a time the "hole" lost its horrors even for the ordinary inmates. Then, too, the strike of inmates that occurred a few weeks later was in part led by the very men who had suffered this attempt to break their wills. It is no secret that the officials of a state prison in which a famous woman "political" was confined found the efforts of this prisoner to carry on propaganda among the other inmates too skillful for them to stop; one official actually admitted that he felt nervous in her presence. In another prison a former instructor in philosophy gave a series of lectures on "The Illusions of Progress" to the inmates of his cell wing; every Monday and Thursday evenings all prisoners were invited to gather at the "corner of Nutt and Rummy streets"—to read an announcement conspicuously posted in the wing—to hear civilization, religion, morality, truth and other subjects discussed from the point of view of a condemned felon. Technically this was no violation of the prison's rules and the few guards who were posted in the wing were unable to grasp much of what the speaker said, so they did not consider it worth their while to interrupt him. Numerous other instances have occurred of men spreading in prison the very doctrines for which, or for conduct based upon which, they were undergoing confinement.

That the members of the committee of the American Prison Association were aware of such incidents and possibly relied upon them to give force to their contentions is evident from their comments upon the militant suffragists. These suffragists served

brief terms in the District of Columbia Workhouse at Occoquan, Va.

"We are not concerned here," says the report, "with their guilt or innocence, but only with that portion of their history which shows that these militants were completely out of place in a work-house, that they could not be made to submit to discipline fashioned to meet the needs of the derelicts of society, and that they therefore destroyed it for the entire institution. Meanwhile their sufferings and trying experiences were utilized to east ridicule on the law and its chosen representatives."

The report was read by Mr. John Koren, chairman of the committee. Mr. Koren happens to be the representative of the United States on the International Prison Commission, a position which he holds by virtue of an appointment from the Department of State. Now, the Department of Justice has so far refused to admit that there is such a thing as a political offender. What we have, therefore, is the spectacle of one government department denying the existence of political offenders while the official representative on a penological commission of another discusses what to do with them.

LIGHT FROM AN UNEXPECTED SOURCE

The real significance of the report is two-fold. First, it presents prison sentences in a new light. These are shown to be not efficacious in themselves, but only in so far as they effect some change in conduct or mental life. Mere imprisonment is a bludgeon; it may knock a man down and out for a time, shut him up and keep him away from others so that he can do no harm to anybody but his fellow convicts, but it has no inherent reformative value. It asks no questions: What wrong did this person commit? Why did he commit it? What kind of treatment will most benefit him? The whole value of a prison sentence lies in the purpose back of it, in the objects and methods of those who are in charge of prisons. Do the officials study the men and women under them? Do they take into account individual differences and varieties of temperament? Do they try to discover the causes of misconduct at their very source—in the habits, nature, environmental experiences and mental characteristics of those who have committed crime? And do they genuinely try to prescribe helpful treatment? Unless they do this, they are wasting time. Imprisonment needs to be supplemented by an intelligent effort to combat causes before it can claim the ambitious title of reformation.

The second point of significance lies in the report's contribution to political thought. While it would doubtless be too much to assume that every warden in the country agrees with its contentions, still the audience that listened received it with applause and gave no sign of disapproval. This is highly encouraging to those who have been im-

pressed by the folly of trying to cope with intellectual and other kinds of nonconformity by the use of repression and the solitary cell. Most European countries have long ago learned that ideas and conscience do not give way before the forces that have heretofore been used to curb the assailant and the porch climber. If we, too, are now learning that lesson, and if our penologists will continue to remind us of it as often as need arises, there is hope that we may yet find a rational way of keeping agitation out in the open, and that whatever changes occur in our national life will come as the result of free discussion and not of a blind, eruptive pro-

test against the effort to destroy discussion.

"Bolshevism," said Lloyd George, "cannot be killed by the sword"; perhaps this is true of less violent forms of social upheaval, and we shall find that no type of heretical opinion, sincerely held, can be killed either by the sword or by the blunter edge of a prison sentence. Unfortunately we are still trying that method upon approximately fifteen hundred political offenders. Now that our penologists have told us that this is wrong, perhaps we shall forget our past, start afresh and in some other way try to persuade our nonconformists that the opinions they hold are wrong.

Home Rule and Tank Rule

ONE thing Mr. Lloyd George has accomplished by his latest proposals for an Irish settlement. He has ended once for all the old claim, "Ireland is a purely domestic issue of the British Empire." Even English newspapers admit that his recent speech was more of a bid for American than for Irish favor. No fewer than six times did he appeal to American analogies, and, as the *London Nation* points out, each time, fallaciously. For example he made much of Northern resistance to secession. But the true analogy to the Irish struggle for freedom is the American Revolution, not the Civil War. For eight centuries England and Ireland have been not federal partners but conflicting nationalities, held together by force, a fact which Irish Americans will not allow us to forget. The British Premier cannot have it both ways. He seeks American support, and yet still guides his course by the star of the Empire, making its interests, real or imaginary, rather than any ethical principle the supreme test of his conduct.

The American reply, at least the liberal American reply, can be put very simply. The peace of the world can never be maintained by imperialism resting on force, whether that imperialism is German, British, or American. If we are to save our children or our children's children from another war in which civilization itself may perish, we must work unswervingly toward the goal of a world federation of free peoples. When in the interests of the British Empire and its supposed military or naval necessities, self determination is denied to Ireland, that simple but fundamental principle is violated. British Government resting not on consent and cooperation but on tanks and machine guns, whether in India, Egypt or Ireland, is morally intolerable and is a menace to the peace of the world.

The whole question with regard to any Irish proposal is whether it will satisfy the Irish people. Nobody pretends that Mr. George's new proposals meet this test. An analysis of their provisions reveal so many defects simply from the standpoint of efficient governmental machinery as to justify the question whether Mr. George ever seriously

intended his proposals to be adopted. Says the *London Nation* of January 3rd:

"The new Bill goes to Ireland, but it is not of Ireland. No Irish party will accept it. No representative Irishman advised its production. Sinn Fein Ireland will treat it merely as a proclamation of war, and Ulster, discerning its lack of seriousness will cold shoulder and finally reject it."

The bill leaves Ireland in England's possession. "The Army of occupation with its tanks and aeroplanes, will still be encamped on her soil, and Dublin castle will remain, to direct it—" Ireland is to have no real fiscal autonomy, much less independence. Nearly half the total revenue of Ireland is allocated to Imperial needs though one of Ireland's causes for dissatisfaction is her dislike of the whole system of imperialism. The Bill "weakens Ireland economically, and may arrest her later progress to a state of comparative comfort. And it exacerbates the strife." It creates "two Irish provinces but no Ireland."

Such is an English appraisal of the measure which is commended to American support. Already its failure is apparent. In the Irish municipal elections just completed, Irish Republicans have gained control of about 75 per cent of the districts. By a kind of informal alliance with labor, Sinn Fein has even reduced the Unionist representation in the Belfast Council from 52 to 37. The vote is the more accurately indicative of Irish feeling because it was taken under an admirable plan of proportional representation.

These facts speak louder to Americans than Lloyd George's sophistries and all the dangers of an unsolved Irish problem will continue unabated. To Anglo-American economic, commercial, and perhaps naval and military rivalry, will increasingly be added the bitterness of those Americans of Irish descent who cannot believe in British faith or honor in any international relationship so long as the land of their fathers is governed like a conquered province.

Englishmen talk of a free Ireland as a menace to England. May she not rather prove a friend and bulwark to the England which dares to try the way of generosity and of justice?

Co-operation in an American Feudal Fief

By JAMES PETER WARBASSE

"**A**TTENTION Citizen!" was the caption on the handbills which announced a mass meeting in a mining town in southern Illinois for the purpose of organizing a co-operative society and establishing a store to play a role in the drama of the high cost of living.

Wasettah has 2,500 population. Its industry is the coalmine. There are 700 organized miners and 400 workers organized in other crafts. So far so good for the freedom of labor. But there is something else in Wasettah besides labor.

Wasettah has a feudal lord. Labor supports his lordly castle on its broad shoulders. It works and eats by his bounty. If he has two new automobiles each year it is true also that the workers live decently, have abundance of food, adequate clothing, and good houses. There is no flagrant poverty nor want in Wasettah. But history is full of instances in which serfs too have been well fed, clothed and housed. How free are the men of Wasettah?

The mine is owned by Emil R. Hogart. His son is superintendent. Also the same Hogart is president of the only bank in Wasettah, of the brewery, of the brick-yard, of the creamery, of the building and loan association, of the chamber of commerce, of the two mines at Wasettah and two other nearby mines, and of a commission house in the neighboring metropolis. He is said to be president or director of seventeen organizations. These organizations all have to do with the employment of the labor or the supplying of the necessities of life of the people of Wasettah. His son is mayor of the town. The farmers whose mortgages he holds sell their produce at his market.

The significant fact from the standpoint of the Co-operative Movement is that Hogart and Son own the store of the town. This is a handsome building which houses a department store, handling groceries, dry goods, clothing, and miners' supplies. Miners have to furnish their own tools. That means they must supply themselves with lamps, drills, wrecking powder, fuses, picks and shovels. Hogart sells them. Incidentally there is another small store, but the seal of Hogart is on it. The mine pay-office is in Hogart's store. The men are not paid at the mine but at the store semi-monthly at 4:30 p. m., just too late to catch the train to Nellville where the necessities of life can be bought for ten to fifty per cent. less than at Wasettah. For example, Hogart gets 40 cents apiece for shovel handles;

the miners have a co-operative society at Staunton, Ill., which sells them at 20 cents and returns to the miner a 10 per cent. savings-return (dividend) on his purchases.

Credit is given to the miners at the store. Anything they owe is deducted from the pay envelope before it is handed to them. The fact that this is in violation of the statute law need not concern a feudal lord. The miners' union keeps its money in Hogart's bank, but is paid no interest. Last month they had \$2,700 there. This is loaned by the bank to the farmers on gilt-edged security at 6 per cent. and juggling, which runs the rate up to 10 per cent. Hogart or his subsidiaries own the houses in which most of the miners live. The rents are exorbitant. A group of houses has recently been built which cost \$1,400 apiece and are sold to the miners for \$3,000. Some instances were reported to me of men being guaranteed jobs if they bought a house, and being refused a roof unless they bought one.

The miners work less than four days a week. They want to work full time. The coal is there in abundance waiting to be dug. But it does not suit the economic interests of the Hogarts to adopt a full time program. For their idle time there is no library nor community center. The co-operative society aims to take care of these needs. It is therefore a dangerous thing; it is not good for feudal lords to have workers to read and discuss their problems together.

THE FIFTY-FIVE MEN OF WASETTAH

There are sixty-five successful co-operative societies in Illinois conducting their own stores. A few of the miners of Wasettah thought they might do the same thing. They had John H. Walker come down and speak to them, and as a result of the enthusiasm which he created they decided to go ahead. They organized the society, got thirteen miners to sign for \$2,000 worth of stock, asked me to come and speak, and proceeded to arrange a mass meeting for a Sunday afternoon. I shall never see a lovelier day nor meet better men than George C. Auberger, Walter Olson, Henry Diel, and John Reider, the officers of the Co-operative Association and of the miners' union. They had expected 1,000 men at the meeting. Seventy were present. Fifty of these were miners, five were farmers. These men were earnest and steadfast.

The annoyance of a disturbing gang of hoodlums failed to make an impression. The fact that the Board of Trade had met a few days before and that the word had gone forth that any miner who attended the mass meeting or interested himself in the Co-operative Movement would lose his job failed to affect the fifty miners of Wasettah. Some of them said that if they lost their jobs there were better jobs elsewhere; others said that if the State organization of the United Mine Workers of America could not handle the matter they would know the reason why. All were sanguine and firm. All were confident that the United Mine Workers would stand by them. One thing we know: there are fifty miners and five farmers at Wasettah who are of the stuff that freedom is made. But what of the other 900?

The local physician and several other neutral citizens wanted to go to the meeting; but in the fief of a feudal lord they know that it behooves them to play safe. None are free excepting those who have within them the reckless spirit of revolt against the injustices of the dominant forces. It is so in all feudal communities.

This condition is not peculiar to Wasettah. It prevails in thousands of industrial cities. And where this is not the case, the same feudal principle is represented by a group or class in the economic organization of the community. It comes to the same thing, so far as the serf is concerned, whether his lord is an individual or a master class.

With the exception of the names of the author and John H. Walker, and Staunton, Ill., the names of persons and places in this article are fictitious.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

"Smiling Vienna"

YESTERDAY I read an article in the Paris "Matin" about "Smiling Vienna." The writer said that it was quite refreshing to see how little the Viennese have lost of their former mirth.

Yes, he is right, there are still some people who smile in Vienna. But who are they? They live in the big hotels, rich fugitives from Poland and Hungary, war profiteers and new comers from abroad, business men of easy conscience and more or less young ladies of easy virtue, the only internationalists who have not failed us during the war! A world of infamy once masked and hidden now flaunts itself in broad daylight. These smiling people without any social feeling, corrupt to the core, are making the most of their brief day, well knowing that tomorrow may bring them their just punishment.

The foreign journalist visiting the city does not take the trouble to look below the surface, he observes with astonishment that "the Viennese" are drinking, eating and making merry, wires the information to his newspaper, it is printed and behold, the legend of "Smiling Vienna."

But go into the homes of our school teachers, our doctors, our small shopkeepers and clerks, to go where the workers live, you will not find much smiling there. We are enduring a winter without coal, without warm clothing. Our babies are dying by thousands for want of food and warmth. The help that is coming from England and America means a great deal to us, but our misery is growing daily to such a ghastly extent that all attempts to lessen our suffering seem useless.

That is the truth about Vienna. The world must know it and spurn the lies that tell about our smiles.

Vienna, December 1919. ANNA NUSSBAUM.

The Cant of Our Talk about Liberty

WHAT we need today is idealism which will not compromise; idealism which will force us to sacrifice our so-called "civilization," root and branch, if it will not give way to the new world order. I believe our Anglo-Saxon civilization has its roots in the blood

of subject peoples, and that we are poisoned. To talk of perpetuating that civilization for a day is repellant. To talk about "liberty" or the maintenance of such liberty as we have known in the past is terrible to my manner of thinking. We do not need the revival of old liberties, we need a new idea of liberty; not a liberty for ourselves in order that we may "help" the subject peoples (that is an English idea); but we must withdraw from every corner of the earth as conquerors; then only shall we have true liberty.

New York City.

A. S.

An American Negro Points the Way

WE only wish that it were possible to live our lives simply, making our contribution quietly as we go about our daily tasks. But it can not be. The terrible phantom of prejudice lurks about us on all sides, and even when we think we have escaped it for a time, we find it hovering near, disguised in form perhaps, but more sinister and insidious with each hateful and cowardly attack.

Our reactions to these are as varied as they are human. At first we were wont to accept it in much the same philosophical spirit as one does death and taxes. All people crave happiness, and thinking about our lot made us unhappy, and so for a time we ceased to think. Things were as they were and we did not see how we could make them otherwise. The things society permitted us to enjoy we enjoyed; and with those she denied us we did not concern ourselves. That this made us provincial is the penalty society as well as we have had to pay.

Some of our good friends then began to read the Bible to us, and we began to think. They read us much of obedience, service, love and justice. We listened, but did not understand as we pondered these things in our hearts.

Then we began to read for ourselves. And we knew that justice had fled the earth. Our souls were filled with hate. We detested everything about them, these fellow countrymen of ours; their patronizing attitude, their dutiful interest in the oppressed, their ill con-

cealed attempt to make us ever servants, and their whispered fear lest we, too, should think and know.

We grew bitter and sullen until we came to realize that hatred bred only hatred, and that the evils of the world being man-made can be remedied by man.

Toward our countrymen oppressors we then felt an infinite pity that their souls were dwarfed, that they had lost their early vision of justice.

With this realization our own task becomes clearer. We must be humble, not in the subservient manner which is the mark of serfdom, but in that conscious humility which inherits the earth; we must work, not from fear, but because of the joy it brings and because the world will be the poorer without our gifts; and we must love, not because love will be returned to us ten, nay a hundred fold, but because only then do we begin truly to live.

Then will it come to pass that the things for which America has stood will once more be restored to civilization—through the very least of her citizens, the American Negro. RUTH ANNA FISHER.

New York City.

Making Us Pay to Put Conscription Over

HERE'S a brand new one! As you know, the National Guard forces are down in Washington pushing vigorously for a bill which provides, among other things, for compulsory military training in the high schools and colleges. They are very active; their propaganda is vigorous and on a good big scale. You will be interested, therefore, to learn where some of their money comes from. I have just learned that at a meeting of National Guard officers in New York city last August, they calmly decided to have the various state governments contribute to the Guard's propogondo fund on the basis of \$750 for each National Guard regiment.

I learned of this quite accidentally, through the refusal of Attorney General Webb of California to sanction the proposed diversion of state funds to that purpose. But the Adjutant General of the California National Guard, in defending his request for state funds to be used for these purposes, declared that the states of New York, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota and Colorado have already contributed officially to that fund.

I can't vouch for the accuracy of this statement but, in a sense, it doesn't matter. The point is that the National Guard is frankly out after state funds for its propaganda work. May I urge your readers to write to their Governors and ask them if they have sanctioned any such use of public moneys and if so, will they please say on what grounds. Of course, there's no need to be rough! Let us just show a sort of deadly interest in the subject.

It may seem like a mere skirmish, but it must be won. Otherwise the papers will be flooded one of these days with cartoons and press stuff boosting the National Guard bills and some people will be wondering where they came from!

In the meantime the American Union Against Militarism needs about \$1,200 for additional printing and publicity to get ready for the big fight in March.

CHARLES T. HALLINAN,
Secretary A. U. A. M.

Westory Building, Washington, D. C.

Answers to Correspondents

G. W. H. (Newtonville, Mass.)—"I have to read such a deal in newspapers and magazines that I disagree with, or abominate, that it is a rare joy to be able to retire for a few minutes with a thing in print that one can mostly

approve. All success to the most "Christian" paper I know."—We do a deal of criticism for using that word Christian but we think it means what you think it means.

E. H. M. (San Jose, Illinois)—"Your October number received last week is full of first-class information, the real stuff we need so much in these trying days."—Thank you. If you come across any items of news which you think ought to be more widely known send them along to us. We'll try to use them. We wish more of our readers would help us in this way.

J. D. L. (Dewar, Oklahoma)—"These are hard times for the underdogs and I am one of them. After having been on strike (I am a mine worker) six weeks for the means to buy a morsel more of bread I am now lying on my back to bed with the flu and chills. Mind you I am not complaining, but it pains me for not being able to comply with many social duties. My subscription to *The World Tomorrow* has been due for quite a while. I am unable to send any money now, but as soon as I am up I will send it."—We will gladly keep your name on our list until you are ready to send the dollar along. Many thanks for the names and addresses of your friends. We have sent a sample copy to each. Here's hoping you get well soon.

B. D. (New York City)—"All my friends are either Democrats, Republicans or heathen. I have sent, with disastrous results, *The New Republic* to a Republican and *The Nation* to a Democrat. I don't dare send *The World Tomorrow* to any of the heathen."—Well, let's be patient—things are moving. Here's the New York Bar Association coming to the rescue of the Socialists. Isn't this a good time to try a sample copy on one of the heathen?

E. C. (Boston, Mass.)—"I hope that the spirit of the Fellowship of Reconciliation may pervade the message of *The World Tomorrow*. I am sometimes just a little troubled by the bitterness that creeps into some of your articles and am even more troubled when sarcasm appears. God has never hurried. This old world isn't finished yet and He hasn't lost faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness."—We appreciate your friendly criticism. There is a bitterness which is barren, and a hate which only destroys. From these we pray to be delivered. But there is a love of one's fellow creatures which justifies denunciation and sarcasm in dealing with cruelty, oppression and hypocrisy. To support this opinion we can appeal to the practice of the greatest of prophets and teachers—even to Jesus himself. "We share your faith in 'the ultimate triumph of righteousness,' only we want to remind men that almost 2000 years ago Jesus preached the coming of the acceptable year of the Lord. We do not ask God to hurry; we do ask men to try to catch up with His plans.

DO IT NOW—Call No. 2

THE Senate has passed a very drastic sedition bill. The House is considering an even more drastic bill, carrying with it the death penalty, which Soviet Russia is abolishing! These bills lend themselves to judicial interpretation which will, in effect, make it within the power of federal officials to stifle radical discussion on the ground that it may lead to violence. Disagreement between the two Houses gives us a little time. Write, therefore, at once to the Civil Liberties Bureau, 41 Union Square, New York City, for a full analysis of both these measures. Telegraph your senators and representatives that we have law enough to deal with real crimes and do not need to copy Russian Cserdom.

The Tragedy of the Latin American Proletarian

By G. ARBAIZA

This story of industrial conditions in South America demands our earnest consideration. Assuredly human brotherhood is a mockery so long as our fellow creatures live under such conditions as are here described.

SOUTH of California, on the plains and mountains and islands stretching all the way from Mexico to Patagonia, there are more than forty million men who toil without knowing the meaning of life. They are a vast, scattered, silent drove of dumb creatures who have never raised their heads. To call them "labor" would be a sarcasm. They are slaves of bronze skin, Indian slaves conquered centuries ago. They are not class conscious; they are not even herd conscious. They till the soil, they labor in mines, forests and factories. They are allowed to procreate and live just as cattle are allowed to procreate and live. If beef could be obtained out of human flesh, these men would be live stock. They are ignored by civilization, and what is worse, forgotten by the heart of man.

The bulk of this population is Indian. In smaller numbers, there are Negroes, mulatos, mestizos, etc. They do not form the entire working population of Latin America, but they constitute the saddest and at the same time the most serious aspect of the labor problem there. In the most populated districts, especially along the coast, Latin American labor is highly organized. The Argentine strikes at the beginning of this year, when hundreds of thousands of men walked out, were a test and proof of efficient organization and solidarity. Argentine, with its cosmopolitan labor population composed of various European elements, stands at the head of the labor movement in Latin America. But against two million organized workers in the more densely inhabited regions, there are forty million outcasts who endure a wretched existence, who are underpaid or not paid at all, and who never see nor enjoy the wealth that their hands produce.

It is these outcasts who obtain the sugar which is speculated with in New York; they cut the lumber which is exported to Europe and made into beautiful furniture for the homes of rich Parisians; they raise the cattle whose meat is served on the tables of London restaurants; they dig out of the earth the minerals which are coined and stored in the richest vaults of the world. Civilization receives many useful and valuable things from these pariahs, but gives nothing in return.

In some cases these unhappy slaves do not work to live. They work to die. They are forced to do work which is fatal to human health, and their employers deliberately and knowingly drive them to death; for example, in the Amazon region in the extraction of india rubber. Lord Bryce bitterly denounced these criminal employers a few years ago. If the South Americans of the upper classes were less self-complacent than they are, we should have in the United States and other countries a score of relief and philanthropic agencies telling of the horrors inflicted on the Indian workers, just as there are today organizations for the relief of the Armenians. But the Southern bourgeois is not inclined to confess the sins of his civilization, and in any case he takes the slavery of the native Indian for granted.

In some cases the Indians do not work for wages. They are dragged to work by force. It is the *enganche*. *Enganchar* means to entrap and to catch. It is the hunting of men, to use them in industry or in political revolution. Even governments themselves sometimes employ the *enganche* for recruiting purposes. The proletarians who are thus driven to work may or may not be paid. It was against this tyranny that the first Pan-American Socialist Labor Congress held last April in Buenos Aires passed a resolution declaring that "it is a disgrace to South America and a demonstration of the barbarism of the ruling classes that in several of its regions widespread slavery under a system called peonage (*conchado, enganche*) is found."

CLERICALISM, THE ENEMY

However, all the outcries of the philanthropists, all the resolutions of labor congresses have not altered the situation nor will they alter it. The social evolution of an enslaved population living under such conditions cannot be accomplished all at once. Labor reforms would not be enough; very likely they would not be effective at all. For the problem is not only political and economic, it is a religious problem. It is religion, the Roman Catholic religion, which holds the South American proletariat in political and economic slavery by its pervading influence in politics, its power in education and its

sway over the minds of the masses.

Evolution through social reform is only possible where there is a developed labor organization. The great bulk of Latin American workers are not organized, indeed it is doubtful whether as yet they are capable of being organized. They lack the necessary spirit. They have been held in the lethargy of Catholicism for four centuries. Before an economic upheaval is possible there must first be a revolution of the mind. Occasionally the workers here and there rebel against their economic conditions, and sometimes political revolutions are successful because the rebellious faction finds adherents among the discontented workers. Even Indian insurrections, represented as racial conflicts, are in fact economic outbreaks. But a social movement of the whole proletariat must be a fully conscious movement, and not until the Latin American worker is conscious of the shackles which the Church has put upon him will he be able to stand up and win his way to freedom.

In North America the white settler has practically exterminated the Indian race. In South America,

the European conqueror mutilated the Indian race but spared its life. That is why there is now a South American Indian proletariat. And the Catholic religion is the instrument which has made that proletariat docile and submissive. So long as the Indian worker fears the divinities and saints that his masters have imposed upon him, he will fear his masters.

Therefore in Latin America the religious question comes before the social and economic questions. That is why all the great reformers of the Southern continent devote their chief strength to fighting the fanaticism, bigotry, and the fear-psychology which the Roman Church has imposed upon the workers.

The spreading of radical ideas among the ranks of organized labor in South America will, of course, ultimately weaken the church's hold and thus aid the liberation of the Indian proletariat. But that liberation will not finally be achieved until the awakened workers of the whole continent recognize Catholic clericalism as their most powerful enemy and meet it face to face in crucial conflict.

Aids to Clear Thinking About Russia

FOR many months calls for information on Russia and on Bolshevism have been piling up on my desk. Is there any certainty about Russian conditions or is it all guess work? What are the best books on Lenin and his political philosophy? Why does *The World Tomorrow* ignore John Spargo's book on Bolshevism? These are typical questions, and to answer them is not an easy problem. First, as to the best books to read, I am tempted to recommend to all those who wish to get a sympathetic approach to both the good and evil of Bolshevism, a volume easy of access—though, to be sure, compiled before the word Bolshevism was current—with the suggestion that they read the fifth chapter of an article by St. James, especially the first few verses; also (in the same volume) the fifth, sixth, seventh and twenty-third chapters of a book by St. Matthew, and, if they have time, the whole of St. Luke's contribution.

As to more modern works, there is at present no one comprehensive book on the subject of Bolshevism. There is perhaps too much to be said from too many angles to make such a book possible, at least at this stage of our knowledge. In regard to revolutionary Russia, however, to my mind, there is one book of permanent value which no one can read without feeling that he has been permitted to look at the actors and scenes in one of the most profound and moving dramas in human history. This is Arthur Ransome's "Russia in 1919," (Huebsch, New York). His clean cut descriptions reveal neither gods nor devils, but men—men of dauntless and unselfish purpose whose strength has been proof against incredible difficulties, and whose

faith is today shaping the whole course of human thought on social affairs. Ransome's book bristles with quotable passages. Here, for example, is the story of what the Committee of State Construction has already achieved. Pavlovitch, its head, telling how the necessity of fighting on so many fronts interferes with constructive work—even with the supply of firewood to Moscow—says to Mr. Ransome:

"Today is the first day for two months that we have been able to warm this building. We have been working here in overcoats and fur hats in a temperature below freezing point. . . . Many of my assistants have fallen ill. Two, only yesterday, had to be taken home in a condition something like that of a fit, the result of prolonged sedentary work in unheated rooms. I have lost the use of my right hand for the same reason." He stretched out his right hand, which he had been keeping in the pockets of his coat. It was an ugly sight, with swollen immovable fingers, like the roots of a vegetable.

The Allies and Associated powers will not find it an easy task to defeat the sort of spirit this story illustrates. This, then, seems to me the one indispensable book for those who want intelligently to discuss the Russian problem.

If we read in addition "The Soviet Constitution and Decrees," John Reed's "Ten Days that Shook the World" (Boni and Liveright), Lenin's "The Soviets at Work," and Bullitt's account of his mission to Moscow, published by B. W. Huebsch, we shall be covering the field fairly well.

THE CASE AGAINST BOLSHEVISM

The vast mass of anti-Bolshevik newspaper propaganda is almost worthless. When it is not false in

itself, it is false in its emphasis. For us to judge Bolshevism by atrocity stories—many of which are obviously made out of whole cloth—is as if Russians were asked to judge America by our hideous lynchings, or England by the recent cold-blooded massacre at Amritsar.

Of course there is an anti-Bolshevik case which should be heard. To some degree it is expressed in John Spargo's "Bolshevism" (Harper Bros., New York). His book has had wide vogue but I do not find myself able to accept the judgment of some of my correspondents as to its high value,—and this that not merely because of William Hard's exposure in *The New Republic* (July 9 and August 20, 1919), of the author's unfair use of material, but because Mr. Spargo simply has not got the qualifications necessary for the role he assumes of authoritative historian and idealistic critic of Bolshevism. He has not been in revolutionary Russia, and does not speak the Russian language. He writes with true *odium theologicum* as a Marxian critic of a sect of Marxians whose creed is somewhat different from his own. He criticizes Bolshevism for its faith in violence and its espousal of "the dictatorship of the proletariat," though he himself was an ardent and uncritical supporter of the Allies in the war and of "the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" (to use socialist terminology), which has prevailed especially since 1914 in France and England, and since 1917 in America.

Arthur Bullard's "The Russian Pendulum, Autocracy, Democracy, Bolshevism" (Macmillan, N. Y.), is on the whole a more just criticism of Bolshevism, but it must be remembered that the author was not in Russia during the more constructive stages of the Soviet regime but was employed by our government as an anti-Bolshevik propagandist in Siberia. Many of his prophecies and constructive suggestions in the chapter "Hands off or stand by" have already been refuted by the march of events, and it is difficult to understand by what moral right Mr. Bullard condemns Lenin's dictatorship while speaking calmly of so imperialistic a solution as a control of Russia by the League of Nations or by one strong nation after the manner of "the pre-war regime in Egypt."

So far as my knowledge goes, the most candid and intelligent statement of the case against Bolshevism from a frankly conservative standpoint is to be found in Professor Emery's article, "Under Which King, Bezonian," in *The Yale Review* for July 1919. He at least realizes the true nature of the conflict, and knows that it springs from fundamental differences of economic interest and of governmental theory, rather than, as the newspaper myth has it, the personal malevolence against the human race of a few plotters mostly Jews hired by German gold to make trouble for the righteous champions of the existing order.

SOME UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

It is, of course, impossible as yet for us to form sound and detailed opinions on Russian conditions. But, at least, some things are clear. We know the theory of Bolshevism or Communism. We know that although it owes its present power to a com-

bination of circumstances and events not likely to be immediately duplicated in such countries as England or America, the contagion of Bolshevik ideas cannot be permanently checked by any process of intellectual quarantine. We know, too, that the Soviet Government has such vitality as to defeat all the bitter and determined foes allied against it, and at the same time take long steps toward the attainment of its ideals.* Obviously it could not have won this large measure of success without the adherence of the great mass of the people.

But when all this has been said many unsolved questions remain. Communism has been obliged to make important concessions in its economic theory in order to hold the support of the peasants. How much farther must this spirit of compromise go? Lenin and the more conservative wing of the Russian communists believe that it is necessary to make certain carefully guarded concessions to foreign capitalists in order to rebuild the industrial machine. What will be the effect of these further concessions upon the working out of Communist ideals? Again, the most internationally minded of all governments owes much of its success to the support of Russian nationalist sentiment, which, above all things, detests foreign invasion. Under changed conditions can the Soviet government maintain the present religious fervor of its internationalism? The dictatorship of the proletariat has gained support both at home and abroad from those who on principle are opposed to all dictatorship, but who vastly prefer Lenin to Kolchak or to any other reactionary capitalist imperialist. What will happen when danger from the latter source is removed?

Yet another question arises,—how successful have the Soviets been in organizing production? Is the economic breakdown of the old regime, followed at once by the Allied blockade and the long struggle with a host of enemies on five fronts, solely responsible for the starvation in Russia or have the industrial leaders been unable to arouse the people to the necessity of work and efficient production? Only peace and the restoration of trade and communication will give us the answer to these questions.

But at least the books I have named can help us to form some judgment as to the real issue between Bolshevism and its opponents. On the one hand we hear it denounced as a menace by those whose privileges it attacks or by those who cannot conceive a world without profit, rent and interest. Most of this opposition camouflages itself behind talk of Bolshevik coercion and atrocities, but it is not difficult to see that its real concern is not for liberty but for property. When these critics are not frankly selfish they are pessimistic. They cannot believe enough in human nature to think that now or in any future time men can achieve a great brotherhood, all of whose members will work for the common good. And this despite the fact that the larger part of the western world long ago nominally embraced a religion which holds out precisely this hope..

* Writers in such conservative papers as the *London Times* and the *Paris Debats* have recently praised Soviet educational work, and even its political enemies have endorsed the Soviet's general system of marriage laws and land laws.

On the other hand, Bolshevism is criticised, and for my own part I believe with justice, from an opposite standpoint by those who cannot believe that it is possible to attain the ultimate ideals of Communism by the method of the proletarian dictatorship with all the hate and bitter intolerance of many of its advocates. Conscription and the iron hand of a strongly centralized state may get immediate results. They will not attain the real goal of world-wide freedom and fellowship until a day comes when men gather grapes from thistles.

However true this criticism of Bolshevism may be, it is nothing but hypocrisy to voice it and support it unless we resolutely set ourselves against the dictatorship of the ruling classes in our western world—a dictatorship none the less ruthless because it is masked behind the forms of political democracy.

Editors, clergymen, employers, all who inveigh against Bolshevism, might profitably keep before their eyes these words of Bernard Shaw:—

"They [the governing classes in Russia and in Britain] both have the same opinion of Henry Dubb, and act on it in the same way.

"True; but their aims are different. Lenin coerces and cajoles in the interests of those whom he coerces and cajoles, and in the name of the prophet Marx. Our British Bolsheviks (like Fanny Squeers, I name no names and say, 'Let them as the cap fits, wear it') coerce and cajole in the interests of property, without bothering about prophets. Profits are good enough for them."

If this be true of England surely it is as true of our own country with its deportees, its political prisoners, its denials of free speech, its shameful oppression of the Negro, and the industrial autocracy of some of its greatest industries.

Something more than the reading of books is necessary to teach us the truth about Bolshevism. The laboratory in which both the good and evil of the system are being tested is in the industrial, political and spiritual life of our own communities,—not alone in distant Russia. And we ourselves may help to give the answer to the very questions we have raised.

N. T.

Essential Books on Russia and Bolshevism

- I. *The Background.*
Origin: "The Soul of the Russian Revolution" (Henry Holt & Co., N. Y.), description of events in Russia from the Revolution of 1905 to March 3, 1917, when the first provisional government was formed.
- II. *Bolshevik Theory.*
Properly to understand this requires some knowledge of socialist and syndicalist thought, particularly, of course, of "The Communist Manifesto" and Karl Marx's "Capital."
Lenin and Trotsky: "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia"—compiled by Louis Fraina. A collection of speeches, etc., setting forth the revolutionary philosophy.
- III. *Early Stages of the Revolution and the Establishment of the Soviet Government.*
E. A. Ross: "Russia in Upheaval."
Bessie Beatty: "The Red Heart of Russia."
John Reed: "Ten Days that Shook the World."
- IV. *The Development of Soviet Authority.*
Albert Rhys Williams: "Lenin" (Scott and Selzer).

M. P. Price: "The Soviet," "The Terror and Intervention," and "The Old Order in Europe and the New Order in Russia." Pamphlets published by the Socialist Publication Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.)

Arthur Ransome: "Russia in 1919" (Huebsch, N. Y.)

Lenin: "The Soviets at Work" (The Raud School, N. Y.).

V. *Soviet Laws and Decrees.*

"The Russian Constitution."

"Decrees of the Russian Government."

"Russian Land Law" (pamphlets published by The Nation, New York).

"Educational Decrees and other Educational Documents of the Soviet Government (Socialist Publication Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.).

VI. *Russia's Relations with Germany and the Allies.*

Judah L. Magnes: "Germany and Russia at Brest Litovsk" (The Rand School, N. Y.).

William C. Bullitt: "The Bullitt Mission" (Huebsch, N. Y.).

VII. *Anti-Bolshevik Books.*

John Spargo: "Bolshevism" (Harper Bros.).

Arthur Bullard: "The Russian Pendulum, Autocracy, Democracy, Bolshevism" (Macmillan).

N. B.—Much of the most valuable comment on Russia is to be found in the magazines; i. e., *The Atlantic Monthly*, *The Liberator*, *The New Republic*, *The Dial* and *The Nation* have all had articles and editorial comment of great importance which have not been republished. *The Metropolitan Magazine* (June and July, 1919) contains Col. Raymond Robins' remarkable story.

The National Urban League an Appeal

THE program of the National Urban League calls for cooperative action on the part of white and colored students of race relations in America for the purpose of improving the living conditions among Negroes and removing the cause of race friction in cities.

The League's program is sufficiently elastic to admit of special service at critical points, but under usual conditions it is as follows:

1. It investigates social conditions among Negroes, with the view to instituting practical measures of relief.

2. It publishes its findings and seeks to get the existing welfare agencies to meet the needs exposed. Failing in this effort, it establishes, if possible, the needed agency either by organizing a committee to assume the work or by shouldering the responsibility itself.

3. The League seeks to develop co-operation among agencies working for Negroes.

4. It furthers the training of Negro social workers. An Educational Secretary visits schools and colleges and publishes articles on the opportunities for social service in an effort to get promising recruits for social service among colored people. The most likely candidates are provided with fellowships which permit them to study at Schools of Social Work.

To further this work funds are urgently needed. A Better Relations Fund has been started and contributions of any size are invited. A. S. Frissell, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Fifth Avenue Bank, New York City, who is Treasurer of the League, will send a grateful acknowledgment.

The Last Page

I HAVE JUST RECEIVED A LETTER FROM CANADA. THAT in itself is nothing, but the writer speaks of having seen *The World Tomorrow*, and that is much. For the Chief Press Censor of the Dominion still rigorously refuses to allow this magazine to enter his domain and thereby corrupt the minds and morals of his faithful subjects. Is it possible that some reckless fellows—I hesitate to call them Reds—as contemptuous of danger as of law and order have smuggled a copy of this journal across the border? Imagine the scene: A dark night; a group of masked men meeting in the outskirts of a little town on the American side, an automobile without lights—whispered countersigns—the quick, silent movements of conspirators—and safely guarded in the midst, a copy of the current issue of *The World Tomorrow*. Then comes the wild, mad rush in the darkness; the thrilling moment when the border is crossed; the arrival at the secret rendezvous. Here, I imagine, the daredevil of the party—though it were invidious to call him that where all are the bravest of the brave—makes a noise like a rooster (always the faithful herald of tomorrow). A tense moment follows. . . . Then mysteriously comes an echo from the dark woods. This is the awaited signal. At once, the chosen messenger, heavily disguised, carrying the secret treasure camouflaged by a fair, new copy of *The Liberator* (which has never been excluded from Canada), dashes across the snow into the depths of the forest. He follows the cry of the rooster for many miles till all danger of pursuit and discovery seems lost. At long last, still guided by the friendly and now familiar voice, he reaches a tall tree, on the trunk of which he seeks for, and finds, the letters roughly carved—W. T. Here in a hollow root he places *The Liberator*, its illegal supplement lurking within—and then dashes from the spot, tearing through the silent forest back to the waiting car and then, as if with Puck himself at the wheel, like lightning to the sanctuary of the border. . . .

I wonder if my correspondent in Ottawa got his copy that way?

AND THIS IS WHAT MY CANADIAN CORRESPONDENT writes: "You are right in what you say about London's simple and beautiful memorial to the war dead. But I have just come over from England and it strikes me that in many parts of the country they are not taking kindly to the idea of war memorials at all. They seem to want to forget the affair. Thus at Stratford-on-Avon, a German field gun, captured by a local regiment, was set up in an open space as a memorial, but recently a great crowd of people seized upon the monster, dragged it from its place, and threw it into the river, where it remains. At another country town, Epsom, a meeting was called to discuss the matter of a town's memorial. The majority favored the erection of a cross in the public park, which had been presented to the town by Lord Rosebery, the ex-Premier, but in a letter to the meeting his Lordship objected to the proposal on the ground that a cross was 'essentially sepulchral and would give the impression to passers-by that the place was a cemetery.' He suggested that such a cross be erected in a public street. A number of discharged sailors and soldiers attended the meeting and presented a request that the

memorial should take the form of a public library, but the meeting held to the idea of a cross, and the soldiers by way of protest left the hall in a body.

At Newton-Abbot, the citizens met to protest against the acceptance by the Town Council of a tank which had been offered by the War Office. One speaker said, "The ugly thing will be only an eye-sore to every one and will remind us of the wholesale murder that has taken place." A wounded soldier said that he and his friends did not want a perpetual reminder of pain and suffering thrust upon them. Another soldier called the tank "the devil of the world."

I SUPPOSE THE CENSUS THAT IS NOW BEING TAKEN is the last which will show an increase in the population of the United States, for with immigration stopped and deportation started and the death penalty instituted for all who think differently from the Attorney General, residence in this country is likely to be restricted to a very select and very Palmerly few. Of course there will be awkward moments for our judges when they come to choose between sentencing obnoxious characters to deportation or death. For, strange as it may seem, it is not always easy to decide as to what nationality a man belongs. Take the case of Paul Freeman. During the war this man was arrested in Australia for being a member of the I. W. W. and was sentenced to be deported as an American agitator, though he himself claimed to be an Australian. He was shipped to San Francisco but the authorities there agreed with Freeman (what's in a name!) as to his nationality, and sent him back. This, of course, was awkward for the Australian police, but one of those administrative geniuses who can always be found in high places in times of national crisis, hit on the happy idea that the man should be interned as a German. Now that peace has been signed with Germany I can almost hear the Dogberry-like a voice of the authorities, "Write him down a Russian." But what if England makes peace with Russia? Well, isn't there a war on with Afghanistan—there you have it. Paul Freeman is an Afghan!

SOME EDITORS ARE GETTING IMPATIENT, IT SEEMS, at the delay in bringing the Kaiser to trial. But they should be comforted by the recent assurance of Sir Gordon Hewart, the British Attorney General, that Britannia is keeping a watchful eye on Amerongen (which in England they pronounce as "I'm a wrong 'un"). "Over fifty thousand documents," says Sir Gordon with his hand on his heart, "are being carefully examined," and "the matter is receiving the closest attention." He admits, however, that there are difficulties in the way. I wonder if he has considered a plan which is calculated to please all parties. Why could it not be arranged for the Kaiser to be tried, condemned and hanged, (and even drawn and quartered) *in absentia*?

YES, BUT LOYAL TO WHAT? I ASKED MYSELF AS I read the headlines, "Episcopal Church Loyal, Says Bishop, Approving Deportation of Anarchists." Loyal to God or Caesar, to Christ or Mammon? Below the headlines I read the report of the Bishop's speech at the dinner in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel and found the answer, "We are loyal," said the Bishop, "to the core." Well, if the Bishop means what I think he means he seems to me to be taking chances—building his house on the sand as it were. For sometimes it looks very much as if, to quote a famous character, "there ain't going to be no core." THE PROOFREADER.

*N. B. The Editor of *The World Tomorrow* tells me that word has just come from the Canadian Censor that he gives his consent to the magazine being circulated in the Dominion provided it does not preach violence. And yet it was excluded for preaching pacifism!

Wanted—1000 World Tomorrow Cooperators

A month ago we wrote to all our subscribers asking them to make possible the continued life of this magazine by becoming World Tomorrow Cooperators. Already 120 have joined up, but we need 880 more to see us safely through the year.

Cooperators are asked to contribute \$5.00 or more to our Guaranty Fund. To them a full report of our year's work will be sent, and from them advice will be sought from time to time on questions of magazine policy.

Won't you join us?—We really need your help

N.B.—These are our latest combination offers: The World Tomorrow (one dollar a year) with

The Nation (weekly).....	\$5.25
The Survey (weekly).....	\$4.00
The Socialist Review (monthly).....	\$2.75
The Irish Press (weekly).....	\$2.80
Good Morning (Art Young's new, illustrated weekly)...	\$3.50

Don't forget to send us the names and addresses of any friends who are likely to be interested in The World Tomorrow. We are now permitted to circulate in
Canada

Again We Thank

our readers whose generosity answered our Christmas appeal for \$5,000, by gifts, totaling \$6,395.55. Later we hope to publish stories of the work to which the money was given.

While our special fund is now closed the work of the Friends' Service Committee goes on. It is seeking to form local committees to aid in collecting funds in some degree commensurate with the need. We urge all who can cooperate to write at once to the Committee at 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia.

Previously acknowledged \$2,621.62. Contributions received between December 18th and January 15th include:

Ackermann, Frances R. \$10.00, A. K. \$5.00, Alfieri, Miss \$1.00, Anonymous \$1.00, Anonymous \$1.00, Anonymous \$5.00, Anonymous \$5.00, Anonymous \$10.00, Anonymous \$5.00, Baltimore Branch F. O. B. \$10.00, Beavers, Mrs. D. \$5.00, Berlin, Marjorie R. \$2.00, Becker, Lillie \$2.00, Berlin, Mrs. Louis \$5.00, Boisen, Anton T. \$2.00, Brooks (Ladies) \$5.00, Brown, Earl B. \$25.00, Brown, Elsie \$2.00, Brown, J. \$2.00, \$21.00, Bruno, Charles F. \$15.00, Bruno, Frederick \$2.00, Hore, Mr. & Mrs. \$5.00, Burton, H. B. \$2.50, Collins, Mary W. \$15.00, Collins, Mrs. \$2.00, Campbell, Mary R. \$2.00, Carr, Clarence \$2.00, Carter, Clarence \$5.00, Central Maine Mission \$11.82, Clark, Dumont \$25.00, Children of Greenwich House \$11.50, Christensen, Alice \$10.00, Coates, Grace E. \$5.00, Cohen, Mrs. \$1.00, Coffey, Bertha R. \$1.00, Connor, Mrs. Murray \$5.00, Crocker, Mr. & Mrs. \$2.00, Crosby, Frances S. \$5.00, Culver, Elmer \$5.00, Davis, Nelson \$5.00, Deha, Marie \$1.00, Deha, Mrs. S. \$20.00, Dickinson, Edward H. \$1.00, Doeller, M. \$25.00, Dolige, Henrietta H. \$1.00, Drury, Julia O. \$10.00, Editorial Board \$25.00, Fabian, Edith O. \$25.00, Fichtler, Rosalie R. \$5.00, Fisher, Clara M. \$25.00, Fletcher, Helen S. \$2.00, Flower, Miss G. \$1.00, Foster, A. F. \$10.00, Foster, Barbara \$2.00, Ellis, C. \$20.00, Friend \$1.25, Friends in Washingtonville, New York \$25.00, Friend \$20.00, Friend, A. R. \$20.00, Gale, Zora \$10.00, Galt, Lewis \$10.00, Gardiner, Helenetta \$5.00, Gardner, Mildred \$5.00, Gardner, Ray \$5.00, Garrett, M. H. \$2.10, German Congregational Church of Fort Collins Colo. \$10.00, German Church of Fort Collins \$5.00, Hagdon, Cecil \$50.00, Glenn, Emily M. \$5.00, Goldfarb, Dwight \$25.00, Goldstein, Leonard \$5.00, Greene, Mary A. \$25.00, Green, Mrs. W. H. \$10.00, Grumfield, Carolyn L. \$5.00, Guthrie, Lulu G. \$5.00, Harbert, Irene A. \$5.00, Hardin, Minnie R. \$5.00, Henderson, Ross \$10.00, Hens, Edna R. \$5.00, Hessner, P. \$10.00, Hirsch, Gertrude \$10.00, Hoffman, Wray B. \$1.00, Hochstet, Ralph \$1.00, House, Florence R. \$10.00, Hubner, Thos. \$1.00, Hughes, Jennie W. \$5.00, Hight, J. Percival \$5.00, Hunt, Mrs. Henry R. \$5.00, Irwin, Emma R. \$10.00, Jaeger, K. L. & P. \$5.00, Jensen, Johanna H. \$4.00, Johnson, Marion L. \$50.00, Jones, Mr. & Mrs. A. W. \$5.00, Juegling, Amy R. \$10.00, Klein, Miss M. \$5.00, Knoch, Paul \$25.00, Krummer, Mr. \$1.00, Kutz, G. V. \$5.00, LaFayette, Clara C. \$5.00, Jarlme, James V. \$5.00, Laves, Caroline \$5.00, Lee, Edward J. \$5.00, Lettman, M. H. \$10.00, Leonard, Louise \$5.00, Liveray, Clara \$10.00, McAfee, L. G. \$2.00, McClure, Archibald \$5.00, McGillif, Gertrude H. \$5.00, Madison, Oscar \$10.00, Mallory, Helen \$10.00, Malmstrom, Boieing \$20.00, Margolis, W. \$5.00, Marston, Amy T. \$10.00, Martin, Septimus \$100.00, Mayer, Herbert \$15.00, Melshager, A. \$25.00, Millesbrook, M. L. \$5.00, Morrow, Chester F. \$5.00, Morse, Frank N. \$2.00, Mofford, Harriet \$1.00, Oppenheimer, Harman \$5.00, Orloff, Theo. R. \$10.00, Osborne, Chas. \$5.00, Osterlin, H. L. \$5.00, Owen, Ed \$2.00, Parker, Mrs. \$1.00, Parkhurst, Mrs. M. H. \$5.00, Patrick, Sara L. \$10.00, Peabody, Dr. Helen S. \$2.50, Pearse, Mrs. F. M. \$5.00, Portland St. Baptist Church Sunday School \$20.00, Powers, Mabel \$5.00, Rhiney, F. K. \$50.00, Richards, E. M. \$150.00, Rleser, Mrs. A. L. \$5.00, Robinson, Edna \$5.00, Roderick, J. V. \$10.00, Roeder, Grace \$5.00, Rowley, Francis H. \$10.00, Sandness, L. H. \$2.00, Sanford, Alice P. \$20.00, Sandness, O. F. \$10.00, Sayre, Ella R. \$5.00, Schlimmer, Max \$100.00, Schmitt, Rev. E. C. \$5.75, Schickel, Fred A. \$10.00, Seligman, L. O. \$10.00, Sewdson, Roger H. \$2.00, Shatt, Mary \$2.50, Shaw, Mark R. \$5.00, Smith, O. A. H. \$50.00, Snowden, Maria R. \$1.00, Saunders, Mrs. F. \$1.00, Nohs, John G. \$1.00, Spring Street Sunday School \$28.25, Spauls, A. L. \$5.00, Stalp, Emily \$5.00, Stetwell, Marion R. \$5.00, Stetzel, F. W. \$100.00, Stifel, R. A. \$25.00, Stillman, Joseph W. \$10.00, St. John's Mission \$1.00, St. John's Church \$10.66, St. Joseph's Church \$10.80, Stone, Robert R. \$5.00, Storer, Frank A. \$5.00, Sweet, Wm. E. \$10.00, The Yvondy Club \$10.00, Thomson, Polly \$1.00, Trevett, Miss E. L. \$4.00, Turner, Clara M. \$25.00, Turner, John \$10.00, Uttermeyer, Mrs. W. \$25.00, Urban, A. L., Jr. \$5.00, Urie, Caroline Finkle \$10.00, Vogel, Conrad F. \$5.00, Wallis, F. L. \$2.00, Walter, Miriam R. \$5.00, Walton, Anna \$10.00, Walters, James \$50.00, Watson, William \$5.00, Weston, Thomas \$5.00, Walter, J. \$1.00, Chase, J. \$1.00, White, Dr. Park J., Jr. \$5.00, Whittemore, Laura E. \$5.00, Williams, C. B. \$10.00, Williams, Laura C. \$200.00, Williams, Margaret C. \$10.00, Winstone, Norman \$5.00, Wohlfarth, Julia H. \$10.00, Women's Bible Class, First Free Church, Philadelphia \$10.00, Total, \$6,395.55.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

. III. No. 3

MARCH 1920

10 Cents

THE PEACE OF PARIS AND THE YOUTH
OF EUROPE—George D. Herron

MR. PALMER SHUDDERS—Albert De Silver

THE CHAOS OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

RELIGION'S LIMITATIONS—Reinhold Niebuhr

A DEFENSE OF CAPITALISM

—One of its Friends

THE DISINTEGRATION OF CAPITALISTIC
IMPERIALISM

ETHICS FOR STOCKHOLDERS

THE COOPERATIVE CONGRESS AT
CHICAGO—Dorothy Walton

THE MAKING OF "AMERICANISM" PRO-
PAGANDA—Harold L. Rotzel

GENTLE REVOLUTION IN GREAT BRITAIN
—Arthur Gleason

NOTRE FRÈRE LE POILU—Mary Kelsey

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the March Number

	PAGE
Signs of the Times.....	67
The Peace of Paris and the Youth of Europe, by GEORGE D. HERRON.....	70
Mr. Palmer Shaddens, by ALBERT DE SILVER.....	74
The Chaos of International Finance.....	76
The New York Legislature on Trial.....	76
Religion's Limitations, by REINHOLD NIBBING.....	77
A Defense of Capitalism, by ONE OF ITS FRIENDS.....	79
Ethics for Stockholders.....	80
The Cooperative Congress at Chicago, by DOROTHY WALTON.....	81
Open for Discussion.....	84
The Making of "Americanism" Propaganda, by HAROLD L. ROTZEL.....	86
The Disintegration of Capitalistic Imperialism.....	88
Gentle Revolution in Great Britain, by ARTHUR GLEASON.....	89
The Church and the Cause of Freedom.....	91
Notre Frère le Pôla, by MARY KELSBY.....	92
Dogmatic Notes on Worth While Books.....	94
The Last Page, by the Proofreader.....	95

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. March, 1920. No. 3

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers, 118 East 28th St., New York.
Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer;
John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gove Hambidge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, John Howard Melish, Ridgely Torrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.00; Canada \$1.15; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.25. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

GEORGE D. HERRON, well known as writer and lecturer, was chosen by President Wilson to attend the abortive conference with the Bolsheviks at Prinkipo.

ALBERT DE SILVER, one of the organizers of the fight against peace-time sedition laws, is a New York attorney and a director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

REINHOLD NIBBING, a graduate of Yale University, is pastor of Bethel Evangelical Church in Detroit, and has been a contributor to *The Atlantic Monthly* and other magazines.

DOROTHY WALTON, formerly a member of the Friends Unit in France, is now on the staff of *The New Majority* in Chicago.

HAROLD L. ROTZEL, formerly a Methodist minister, is Secretary of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in Lawrence, Massachusetts.

ARTHUR GLEASON, author and journalist, is perhaps the chief American authority on British labor.

MARY KELSBY served for more than a year on the Friends Unit in France.

A new national weekly

The Freeman

IN MARCH, Mr. B. W. Huebsch will begin to publish *THE FREEMAN*, a new weekly edited by Mr. Francis Neilson and Mr. Albert Jay Nock. *THE FREEMAN* is planned to meet the new sense of responsibility and the new spirit of inquiry which recent events have liberated, especially in the field of economics and politics. It will follow developments in all phases of international life.

In dealing with public affairs *THE FREEMAN* will concern itself more with the principles of politics than with political events, personalities, or superficial issues; and especially with the economic principle that underlies politics. In its treatment of news *THE FREEMAN* will not compete with the daily newspaper or with any weekly résumé of news. Nor will it compete with such organs of special opinion as are now serving a large public exceedingly well. It will also present sound criticism, freely expressed, upon literature and the fine arts, besides offering American and foreign works of creative imagination.

To B. W. Huebsch, Inc., Publishers of
THE FREEMAN

32 West 58th Street, New York City

I enclose \$2.00 (\$6.50 in Canada; \$7.00 foreign) for one year's subscription to *THE FREEMAN*, or I enclose \$1.00 for a ten weeks' introductory subscription.

Name

Address

The publisher will be glad to have names of persons interested in receiving a sample copy of *THE FREEMAN*.

D-3-20

COMBINATION OFFERS

THE WORLD TOMORROW (one dollar a year) with

The Nation (weekly).....	\$5.35 saving \$2.13
The Survey (weekly).....	4.35 saving .75
The Socialist Review (monthly).....	2.75 saving .75
The Irish Press (weekly).....	2.80 saving .70
Good Mornings (Art Young's new illustrated weekly).....	2.50 saving .50

Foreign and Canadian postage extra.

Canadian subscription to *THE WORLD TOMORROW*, \$1.15 a year; Foreign, \$1.25.

Don't forget to send us the names and addresses of any friends who are likely to be interested in *THE WORLD TOMORROW*.

Don't
Miss
It!

The most piquant and witty satire in years.
You will chuckle over it from the first page to the last.
THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET WUDRO

The Statesman Press, New York

25 cents a copy. Postpaid 27 cents.

For sale through THE WORLD TOMORROW Book Department

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 3

MARCH, 1920

10 Cents

Signs of the Times

The Unsolved Railway Problem

THE heads of the railway brotherhoods and unions have met President Wilson's proposals for averting a strike on the wage question in a conciliatory spirit, prompted it may be by a realization that their interest in a proper adjustment of the whole railroad situation is greater than in winning more wages. It is, to say the least, open to doubt whether a general railroad strike at this time merely on the question of wages would further the Plumb Plan or any similar constructive proposal.

Meanwhile the present Congress has shown no disposition to consider any radical solution. A little while ago it seemed doubtful whether the Senate and House could agree on any legislation before March first, when the roads are to be returned to their owners; but at last the Conference Committee has agreed on a measure which it is said will follow the lines of the Esch rather than the Cummins bill. There will be no absolute prohibition of strikes as in the Cummins bill, but pending the report of the Federal investigating board, strikes will be illegal. There will be a guarantee of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent return to stockholders. The effect of this guarantee will be to give stockholders \$400,000,000 more than their properties earned during normal times. The inevitable increase in freight rates will in the opinion of Director General Hines add \$4,000,000,000 to the cost of the necessities of life. Under the terms of the bill well managed railroads will have to divide their earnings with those that are over-capitalized and inefficiently managed. Financial papers have attacked both the justice and the constitutionality of this provision. In short, if the compromise bill is passed, it will be a law which will really satisfy no one. Powerful interests, however, welcome it as at least better than the Plumb Plan on the one hand, or the pre-war status on the other.

Despite the abuse that has been showered upon the Plumb Plan, it embodies principles which sooner or later will prove necessary in grappling with the railroad problem. We wish the present system of government control could have been continued pending the process of educating the public. It would, however, have been unfortunate if labor had too easily won the control provided in the Plumb Plan. First it must educate itself. There are signs that the task is proceeding. The interest of the railroad brotherhoods in the cooperative convention at Chicago, the action of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees in acquiring

several clothing factories, the vitality of the Plumb Plan League itself in spite of certain troublous times through which it has passed—these are all good omens for the future. But not so much can be said of the recent action of one of the strongest railway unions in continuing its exclusion of Negroes from membership. Not in this spirit will the evils of the capitalistic control of the railroads be remedied.

Secretary Baker's Holy Inquisition

THERE are still about eighty conscientious objectors in American prisons. Those in the internment camp at Ft. Douglas are treated well. They run their own mess and do their own work. It is an open secret that if they would burn a pinch of incense on the altar to Caesar,—that is, agree to do prison labor under military orders,—most of them would be released. As it is these men are victims of outrageous discrimination, for dozens of their comrades whose position differed from theirs in no essential degree are today free men. Among those still confined, despite the fact that confinement is telling on his health, is Howard Moore, whose record is singularly sincere and consistent. He is the winner of a Carnegie hero medal and during the influenza epidemic rendered invaluable volunteer service in the hospital at Ft. Riley.

At Alcatraz confinement is more severe. The prison authorities have adopted the infamous device of confining recalcitrant prisoners in cages so constructed that a man cannot possibly sit down.

At the present time two conscientious objectors are thus confined—Grosser, a Jewish political objector, and Simmons, a Negro religious objector. Both of them have refused to work under military orders, and Simmons in addition refused to answer census questions. Men recently released charge that both men are in part victims of racial discrimination. Grosser is an objector of a very aggressive type, and men from the prison say that his mind has been visibly affected by the severe sufferings imposed upon him, not only now but throughout his experience in prison. Simmons is more phlegmatic in type, but to the average sane man it ought to be obvious that failure to answer census questions indicates a condition of mind not to be cured by being compelled to stand in a cage all day long. Yet apparently the War Department is so pleased with this latest humane device that it has actually announced that similar cages are to be

introduced in Ft. Leavenworth. To the credit of California papers be it said that they are giving very considerable publicity to the brutality at Alcatraz, and it is possible that what the War Department will not do for humanitarian reasons it may do under pressure of public opinion. The issue involved is not one of special consideration for political prisoners, but of the essential cruelty of solitary confinement in general, and this form of it in particular.

Trials Worth Watching

THERE are two criminal trials arising directly from the labor conflict which deserve close attention. One of them is in Winnipeg where the leaders of the general strike which occurred last spring are now on trial for sedition. Mr. R. B. Russell, one of those leaders, has already been convicted by a jury to which Judge Metcalfe had given a stump speech filled with references to the patriotism of their fathers who had driven back the Americans from the walls of Quebec and the like. Seven others are on trial now, and in a few days the trial of Jim Woodsworth, pacifist and ex-Methodist minister (whose story was told in our September issue) will begin. One of the counts in the indictment against Mr. Woodsworth charges him with no more heinous offense than quoting the following paragraphs from the Prophet Isaiah:

"Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievancees which they have prescribed; to turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey and that they may rob the fatherless."

"And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall enjoy the work of their hands."

These trials will come close to deciding whether or not under Canadian law a general strike carried on without violence primarily for the redress of economic grievances is legitimate or seditious. To declare such a strike seditious comes dangerously near inviting violent revolution.

The second significant labor trial is being held at Montesano, Washington, where the members of the I. W. W. are charged with conspiring to fire upon and kill the men in the Armistice Day parade at Centralia. We have already called attention to the evidence produced before the coroner's jury to the effect that the paraders had first attempted to break into the hall before any shots were fired. Later on they hung Wesley Everetts, an ex-service man, but no arrests have yet been made for this murder. The story of the situation in the Northwest is graphically told by J. T. Doran of the I. W. W. in the February *Liberator* under the title "Murder in Centralia." It is a story worth reading. The bitterness of the conflict he describes is illustrated by the recent act of a judge of the Superior Court in Spokane in holding that membership in the I. W. W. is a legal offense which can be dealt with by an injunction granted on the ground that "its activities . . . constitute a general public nuisance and menace to this country."

L'Etat c'est moi

MR. LANSING has added no luster to the Department of State; his Russian policy (how much of it was his and how much the President's?) was a masterpiece of ineptitude. His Mexican notes were third-rate in expression and headed us straight toward a war of intervention. Nevertheless, sympathy must go to him in his break with President Wilson. Apparently the strained relation between the President and his chief cabinet officer go back to the Paris Peace Conference, where, according to Mr. Bullitt's testimony, Mr. Lansing's grasp on moral and economic realities was better than that of his chief, who by the way gave him hardly more confidence than one reposes in an office boy. The President's immediate criticism of Mr. Lansing for calling together the Cabinet during the long illness of its head is wholly unjust. In summoning these Cabinet councils Mr. Lansing performed a real service both to the country and to the President. Mr. Wilson's assumption that he must have virtually absolute power even when he is seriously ill is most disquieting, and the petulant tone of his letters bodes ill for the future. Has his long illness only augmented his natural disposition to govern autocratically? If so it is a matter of serious concern to the country over which he will for more than a year exercise the enormous power of the Presidential office.

Wanted: A Foreign Policy

MEANWHILE it was never more important that America should have a foreign policy. The treaty situation is badly tangled. For a time it looked as if Messrs. Lodge and Wilson, stimulated perhaps by Viscount Grey's effective letter, might manage to patch up some sort of ratification of the treaty without waiting for that referendum at the next election which once appealed to both of them. If they fail it will be for partisan and personal reasons rather than for any lofty reasons of public policy.

But treaty or no treaty we can scarcely draw back into our shell after attempting the moral leadership of the world. It must be confessed our European crusade has had no very satisfactory moral results. Neither ourselves nor our former Allies have any settled Russian or German policies; we destroyed the Berlin-Bagdad corridor, but we replaced it with no economic unity or spiritual fraternity, so that today the peoples who live along that corridor do not really live at all but merely exist, stricken with famine and burning with mutual hate. The Balkan tangle persists; Italy and Jugoslavia have not settled their difficulties. There is not even a formal peace signed with Turkey, and the old Ottoman empire is the scene of the contending ambitions of Greeks, Italians, Turks, Armenians, Arabs, Syrians, Zionists, French and British. Of these the British and French are most to blame for they are infinitely the strongest. While the diplomats of these great empires wrangle, the strong massacre the weak and in large areas weak and strong starve together. In the Far East there has been no solution of the Shantung quarrel or

redress for Korea's wrongs. In India rebellion against England smoulders. British troops still fight in Afghanistan and British aviators only recently bombed defenceless villages from the air. Egyptian hatred of British annexation which Mr. Wilson was persuaded to recognize between lunch and dinner one morning in Paris not only continues but increases. Such is the world after our crusaders—we use the word in no spirit of mockery—returned in triumph. But what arms failed to do, a crusade of ideas and of friendliness might accomplish. Unless we undertake something of the sort, our children if not ourselves may pay a terrible price.

* * * * *

Since the foregoing paragraphs were written has come the news of the President's protest against the Anglo-French-Italian agreement on the Adriatic problem. According to the despatches he goes to the extent of threatening to withdraw from European affairs* if the Allies insist upon the arrangement they have made without consulting him. That arrangement is distasteful to the Jugo-Slavs and is on the whole the kind of imperialism to which America's ideals were opposed. Had President Wilson made this sort of vigorous protest in February, 1919, instead of February, 1920, and had he applied his principles to all imperialism and not merely to Italian ambitions, it is possible that the history of the world might have been different. As it is, we fear that the moral weight of what Mr. Wilson has done will be impaired by his sickness, his waning hold over his own country, and his autocracy in the Lansing affair.

The Irish Show the Way to Peace

PRESIDENT DE VALERA has taken the opportunity of the Sinn Féin victory in the municipal elections to make an announcement which may partly avert the fatal crisis that seems fast approaching in the conduct of the English army of occupation toward the citizens of the Republic of Ireland. On February 6th, President De Valera announced that to allay such fears as England might entertain regarding her security, the Republic of Ireland was ready to negotiate any precautionary arrangement that would not infringe upon Ireland's sovereignty. He emphasized the precedents of the first article of the Cuban treaty, and of the Monroe Doctrine, by which American statesmanship insured the security of the United States among its free neighbors. And he contrasted the efficacy of these safeguards with the piling of coercion upon coercion in Ireland which imperils England's security everywhere because it rouses resentment among all free people. A friendly Ireland would be England's staunchest bulwark and a free Ireland would be an Ireland friendly to England. This statement from him who in his own person has suffered all but the last sacrifice to England's rule

is a message of peace that will be grateful to all who are weary of war. It does not, as some of our papers have assumed, indicate a change or modification in the Irish position. It merely calls attention to the fixed desire of the Irish people for peace with all nations. The dignity of nationhood precludes the perpetuation of hatred in the democratic Republic of Ireland. Is it too much to hope that this self-respecting and friendly attitude on the part not only of Mr. De Valera but of the people in Ireland will awaken a similar disposition in Great Britain?

About The World Tomorrow

ON February and Walter G. Fuller, who has been associated with *The World Tomorrow* from the beginning, began his new work as a member of the editorial staff of the *Freeman*. *The World Tomorrow* owes an enormous debt to Mr. Fuller's fertility of ideas and editorial skill. He will be sorely missed by us all, but we rejoice that he has found it possible to accept an election to the Editorial Board. On February 16th, Mr. Gove Hambidge, who has been connected with R. M. McBride & Co., publishers, came to *The World Tomorrow* as Assistant Editor. *The World Tomorrow* counts itself fortunate in the arrangement it has been able to make with Mr. Hambidge.

Since the Christmas fund for relief of children of Austria and Germany was closed *The World Tomorrow* has received \$559.10 from various friends. Their gifts have been forwarded directly to the Friends' Service Committee without passing through our books. They raise the total amount given in response to the appeal published in our December issue to the sum of \$6,954.41. Our generous friends thus enabled us to exceed the goal we had set for ourselves by \$1,954.41.

In these days of appalling needs we hesitate to set before our readers the financial problems of *The World Tomorrow* itself. We are only justified in asking support of those who agree with us that it is a real service to keep going a magazine which attempts to deal with the problems of our time from our particular viewpoint. As most of our readers know, on December 15th we sent out a circular letter explaining our financial situation and our program for the year, and asking for support. The response to that letter has been encouraging. To date we have enrolled 170 Co-operators who have paid \$5 or over to our Guarantee Fund. It is our desire to make cooperation mean something more than financial contribution. *The World Tomorrow* does not pretend to infallibility or omniscience and welcomes the advice and suggestions of its Co-operators and other readers. Even since the date of our circular letter there have been increases in costs which make it certain that with the most careful management the efficiency if not the life of the magazine this year will depend upon securing a Guarantee Fund of \$15,000. This is no small sum, and it is far from being in sight. To secure it, we must rely upon those who share our belief in the value of the paper. We should be glad to send particular information in the matter of budget and plans to any who request it.

*This report is now definitely confirmed. The President's threat is, to our mind, justified and America's withdrawal from underwriting the Peace of Versailles would be generally supported. We imagine, however, that Allied diplomacy will exert itself to try to hold President Wilson's support for the Treaty.

The Peace of Paris and the Youth of Europe

By GEORGE D. HERRON

The first instalment of this remarkable article appeared in our February issue. We desire to renew our thanks to Professor Herron and his American publisher, Mr. Mitchell Kennerley, for permission to publish it in advance of its appearance in book form.

WHY did Paris fail—fail so easily and so utterly—in the face of an expectation so prevalent, so highly compulsory, as seemingly to render some divine fulfillment inevitable?

The failure lies in this, that the Conference, from its first morning until these driving latter hours of its calamitous career, has been under the control, occult but conclusive, of Europe's hoary masters—the money-lenders. It is these, their immemorial calling regarding not the souls of nations, and the weapons and the hostages of all the world in their hands, who darkly prevailed at the peace-table.

It was inevitable, therefore, that no spiritual principle should be given occupation at that board. The influences there operative rendered the peace-makers infidel, from first to last, to the initial pledge and the professed creed whereon they came together. The Conference, blinding the eyes of its greatest participant and of his closest friend, devoted itself into a solemn meeting for the division of the spoils; for the allotment of fertile fields to the concessionaires. The incredible contrivances brought forth under the name of peace were born of either bargain or essential blackmail. Not the souls of men, nor the souls of nations, but oil and iron, coal and gold, potash and copper, turned the scales of decision. All the blood and tears of these terrible yet expectant years, all the assembled hopes of the beaten generations of men, were sacrificed by the Great Powers to the mighty usurers. The peace is theirs, the usurers' and the concessionaires'—a peace whereby, through the highly-phrased diplomatic pimping of their procurers, they filched the natural resources of the planet, and sentenced its populations to choose between national slaveries, death by starvation, and suicidal revolt. General Smuts was right about the Conference—and he but scantily hinted at his opinion of it—nothing could conceivably be as bad for the world as its continuance.

XIII.

So it is not strange, in the light of its secret motives and processes, that division, not unity or concord, comes out of Paris. For in the material motive, in the individual and national egotisms issuing therefrom, there is no uniting principle. The material motive always divides: it is the spiritual motive only that unites. It is the material motive that shapes the swords of division—that creates the mine and the thine of individuals and classes and nations. And from mine and thine come the wars, and the most of mortal woes: and from mine and

thine comes also the advancing dissolution of the present world.

XIV.

The social disintegration precipitated by the war, and sealed by the Great Powers at Paris, was inevitable; for its structural stuffs were chance and contradiction. These contain no enduring qualities: they ordain whatsoever builds upon them to self-destruction.

But this is not the chief flaw and failure. Our civilization has modernly evolved without reference to our essential humanity: it has taken no account of the soul. Or, rather, our industrial and social machinery has reduced the souls of men to servitude, and of the souls of nations it has made grist for the money-lender's mill. Progress, for some generations, has been synonymous with the soul's descent into social cowardice and meanest dissolution. And it is because of this, and for the release and remanning of the soul, and as a fearful prelude to the world-soul's birth, that our civilization is given over to a destruction that must ultimately prove divinely creative.

For what is happening to the essential man is all that matters. Historic institutions and policies have all been judged, in the end, by what account they could give of him—by what account they could give of the soul, by what account the soul could give of itself in the midst of them. The world's catastrophe is but a calling of the world's managers—its owners, its diplomats, its governments—to to the judgment-seat unto which the soul is the only concern. And the general dissolution is the consequence of their having no answer to give to the Judge thereon seated.

It is but for the making of man, indeed, that our universe exists; and that civilization is dissolving through its collision with that universal reason for being. And the collisional action will continue until, from highest pinnacle to deepest foundation, our present world-order becomes but a dark and dusty memory. Nor will another and new order be any the more able to stand, no matter how radically it differs from the old, unless the motive of its laws and machines be the enabling invocation of the soul. Nothing the peoples or leaders may henceforth make shall be able to justify or establish an existence, except so far as they make for the soul's expansion; for the soul's march from freedom to freedom; for its achievement of that manhood which, patterned once and forever in Palestine, and looming now anew and larger over the world, is our one eternal standard of measure.

XV.

But, you will ask, since we know the great betrayal, and since the general chaos we know, and the thicker financial yoke also, what hope have we—with what promise can we path anew our mortal pilgrimage? What has humanity gotten out of the great catastrophe, after all, that may inspire any solacing or renewing effort?

We have this: the preparing of a definite end of a world in which any kind of bondage can be. It is true we are in the wilderness still: but it is also true we are out of Egypt: we are on our way to the undisclosed promised land. Whether our years in the wilderness be few or many depends, of course, upon ourselves—upon what quality and collectivity of will the peoples develop. Nevertheless, it is for the soul to rejoice and not lament the dissolution of the present order. For our civilization cannot be reformed: it can only be dissolved, or else undergo an entire inner and outer regeneration. It has deceived and dazzled by the height and the might of its material achievements; but it is no less corrupt and false in its fundamental motives as well as in its methods and institutions. Its material-mindedness is fatal not only to the spiritual existence of humanity: it is false to even a true material continuity.

XVI.

Yes, the old creeds, the old laws, the old ways of directing the affairs of men, they are all dying or dead: let them pass, let the dead bury them. The sword they shaped has failed, the diplomat has failed, the financier has failed, the intellectual and the expert have failed also: leave them to their failures. Not by clinging to the world that is crumbling can you save what spiritual treasure the past has preserved, or what good the present holds, or work these into the new and nobler world-structure. It is not the salvation of the old but the creation of the new to which we are called. It is neither reformation nor spiritual recovery that awaits us: it is the utter new birth of mankind.

XVII.

So upon the failure of Paris we may pivot profound hopes for the future. The world's present despair carries in itself the portent, the ripening process, of a new quality of collective reflection, purpose and action. The vanity and vampirism of the old order, its loathsomeness and ugliness, the fraudulency and meanness of the methods by which it has maintained itself, these today stand forth nakedly. By our abandonment of hope for this vile order, we reach forward, even if but blindly, even if but blunderingly, to an order wherein the abundant life may be commonly lived.

Indeed, the law of the new earth is already upon us. We may deny the new law; we may delay the new earth. But the law cannot be revoked or evaded; nor can the old earth be restored. We may accept the new world and live; we may disavow it and die; but there is no escape from its summons. And there is no turning back; there is only a going forward. Fearfully we may go and perforce, or manfully and burningly; but howsoever we go, with

what lack or strength of heart, it is only the onward way lies open—that, or the descent of the world into a death from which mayhap there is no resurrection.

XVIII.

But the waiting new world cannot come through division—through our reaching again for the sword. Let us remember that it was under the spell of the sword, while our attention was highly fixed upon freedoms not yet achieved, and amid unprecedented military heroisms and martyrdoms, that the usurers made strong the new fetters they now fasten upon the nations. If we take again the sword, it is the usurers we shall again serve, and ourselves and not they shall be defeated.

The work of the sword, such as it is, is done. If it be true that only war can overthrow the old and the evil—because men do not willingly go forth from the forms that are outworn and corrupt—that is all that war can do. The sword can only destroy, it cannot create. It hath no power to construct or establish the good or the enduring.

The forms of the new world will not be fashioned by the clash of armies. Brotherhood cannot issue from war between states, from war between classes. Not through division but through union, not through conflict but through conciliation and co-operation, not through more death but through more life, not down the broad ways of hate but up the highways of love, and by climbing them hardly, shall we envision the new heaven and effectuate the new earth.

XIX.

Nor can the new world be brought forth by the ongoing struggles of either the new or the changed nationalities. It is not for an actual freedom these now fight; not for true self-determination, true self-expression: it is for coal and iron and oil, for potash and cotton, for copper and gold; and for the yet remaining undeveloped sources of wealth, for special economic advantage and material dominance. These racial strifes, these relentless national egotisms, adding destruction to destruction as they do, are but the offensive and defensive cupidities which the Great Powers, each for its own vile but veiled ends, have artificially instilled among the lesser peoples.

* * * * *

Even when it came to principles, each European Power, great or small, looked upon the Fourteen Points as something to use in obtaining for itself the largest possible territorial, material and military expansion. Each had in view the selfish gain that could be wrested from a particularist application of the Points. Each laid upon Wilson the burden of its claims and the responsibility for realizing them. Each demanded his help in getting the thing it wanted for itself: not one offered to help him get the thing he so tremendously wanted for the world, and which was so indispensable to the world's rational ongoing.

Whence the nations, great and small alike, are losing their lives through falsely saving them—through the concentration of each upon its own material advantage, its own territorial enlargement.

The nation that would now renounce itself for the common healing of all; the nation that would now base itself upon an honest application of the Fourteen Points; the nation that would now undertake the actual realization of Christ's law of love in international relations—that nation, however small, whatever its past, would have the spiritual leadership of Europe, if not of the world. Such a gesture of renunciation, divine in its quality and consequence, irresistible and regenerative in the power of its appeal, would magically liberate the common impulse of good-will now suppressed, and only needing release in order to function itself quickly and manifoldly, and to constitute the world anew and divinely.

XX.

It is upon the youth of Europe that the burden of the uniting renunciations must fall, and by whom the divine initiative must be taken. It is by the young men and women of these nations, reaching hands across every kind of frontier, psychical and social as well as geographical and political, that the capitalized hate must be overthrown. It is these who must give office, give function and power, to the yet unorganized good-will, the latent social love, omnipresent in the peoples. It is these who must wield the wands before which the uncreative forces and the accumulating terrors of this retributive time shall flee away. It is these who must interpret the world's awakening communist mind, and follow and transfigure it; for this mind, though its early ways be rude and ruinous, is yet predestined to universal conquest, and is charged with the elements of the world's Christly renewal.

XXI.

I have said the youth of Europe, and it is to these I now make appeal. But let me say, at this point, that not for a moment do I think that the American crusade for a free and clean world is abandoned. The crusade is turned back upon itself, for a time, beaten and put to shame. It was beaten, I say, for the youth of America did not willingly fail their ideal. They were cheated and exploited by the same foes whereby the youth of Europe and the hope of the world were cheated and exploited. But not for always, not for long: these American youth will rise again, and rise anointed and resolute—will rise with a knowledge of who their real foes are, and of the great task they have to perform.

* * * * *

XXII.

Yet, as I have said, it is the youth of Europe, rather than the youth of America, to whom the urgent new gates of opportunity first open. For the moment, reaction reigns in America, and we are vainly trying to rid ourselves of the tremendous world-burden divinely bound upon us. But Europe, midway between awakening and wondering Asia and reactionary if chosen America, is dissolving and flowing in the melting-pot of the future. It is therefore to the youth of these European states, holding the on-coming centuries in their hands, that

the "word of the Lord" comes immediately. It is for them to take the new initiative, following not the little Bismarcks and the brittle Marxians, neither the triumphant imperialists nor the clamorous nationalists, but Jesus and John Milton, Lammenais and Mazzini—and Woodrow Wilson's first principles. It is for these European youth to pronounce and procure an international order wherein love shall be both the directing intelligence of the state and the law of industrial association. This—or the doom of the white race in Europe, Asia and Africa draws near.

That doom has already been sounded upon the plateaus of Asia and by the rivers of Africa; and the failure of the youth of Europe to see and seize their opportunity would seal the doom irrevocably. If these youth prove unequal to their hour, if they choose compromise or inaction rather than new initiative and creation, then they and their lands may be lost in the loosed Asian tide; whence, after many terrible years, after the whole family of man has dwelt long in the darkness now descending, the yellow race, or the brown or even the black, may bring forth a civilization that shall release the soul and convolve the new heaven and the new earth.

XXIII.

But the leagued youth of Europe must include in their purpose, in their searching and profound apprehension, far and fundamentally more than the problems of peace between States. Even these problems, urgent and charged with peril as they are, rest back upon primary industrial conclusions. The industry of Europe is prostrate—much of it wrecked beyond early repair; and no revival or reconstruction is possible along the former lines of either capitalism or laborism. By the exigencies of war, not only has the capitalist management of industry broken down; not only has the incompetence of the capitalist control of society been demonstrated: there has been an equal demonstration of the political incompetence of orthodox socialism—of that socialism which proposed an international social reconstruction through class-revolution; and there has been a like breakdown of former defensive methods of organized labor. Both labor and capital—indeed, all the functions and organs and offices of both industrial and political society—have gone into the pit together. Nor is there any certain issue therefrom save by the discerning and determined good-will of all classes and conditions, co-operate and co-ordinate.

XXIV.

No class-solution of the problem of economic production, distribution and control is now possible. The interest of no class, of no man, can now be dealt with apart from the interests of all classes and all men. We are all in the human scrape together: we must get out of it together: else we of this generation shall not get out of it at all. The only way of industrial and social escape—of the escape of the world from death by strife and starvation—is by a purpose, by a program, which includes the willing and comprehending co-operation

of every class, of every man, from the topmost to the downmost. Our membership one with another is something we cannot further evade or defer, either in theory or practice. Mankind must henceforth act together as one economic body, one spiritual entity, one planetary family and household—else mankind will perish from the earth.

XXV.

The war has precipitated the fact of human indivisibility beyond repeal or recall. We can no more antagonize it or ignore it than we can antagonize or ignore the air we breathe, the ground we walk upon. And this disclosure of the social and economic indivisibility of mankind constitutes the most drastic, and most radical, the most revolutionary happening of history.

Not that the knowledge of this unity has ever been absent from man: it was long ago cried aloud, both by Christ and the prophets of the farther East; but now it is vocal in every loaf of bread we are able to procure, as well as by the discovery that America dare not let Europe die, lest she herself perish also. We have but faintly apprehended the revolution yet; but it is here, life's most determining and judicative fact. The sooner we discern and acknowledge it, the sooner we shall begin to save the whole race of men from still deeper perdition; and so much the sooner shall we start upon an ascension into undreamed-of power and prosperity—into a power that, just because it is the activity of associative love, and therefore a spiritual power, must inevitably subdue all natural forces and materials to its commands and uses.

XXVI.

Had the war not been, a new social creation, at first both good and evil, might have resulted from the conflict between the proletariat and the proprietor, between those who operate the tools of production and those who own them and reap the profits. Sooner or later, in the course of an exhaustive historical process—and doubtless at immense spiritual cost and through great loss to our essential humanity—the proletariat would have conquered the possessor. Out of this conquest and probable period of collective tyranny, a new and more providential society might, at last, have come.

But not by this way can the new society come now. As I have already pointed out, all the functions and offices, all the classes and controls, all the elements and materials, of the existing society are disintegrating together—are being resolved into one fiery social nebula. And only by a great common and compelling impulse in all classes, each undertaking the utmost reconciliation and co-operation with each, can there come forth that human order which, after all, the whole world desires—an order eventuating in one loving family of adequate and equally advantaged men.

XXVII.

I speak thus imperatively, thus presumptuously if you will, because I perceive mankind to be caught,

today, between two equally fatal reactions—that of an international Tory capitalism on the one side, and that of an international materialist Bolshevism on the other. These, alike vicious and vindictive, alike super-tyrannous, alike destructive of essential socialism or industrial democracy, are also alike full of death for society and the soul. On the triumph of either of these waits the spiritual end of our humanity. But, though between the deathful two we tremble today, it is not needful that either be our choice. We may choose the better way I have already indicated—the way which, running through all the creative movements of our era, leads to the practice of Christ by the whole economy of man.

It is not easy to speak thus, and one who ventures so to speak may well do so with profound fear and trembling. For threatening indeed is the outlook and the way, at this human juncture, of those who go not with Caiaphas and Herod, nor yet with Barabbas and his followers: for these two camps, hateful as they are to each other, will inevitably howl together today, as they did yesterday, for the death and disgrace of whoever speaks the word and seeks the way of reconciliation.

Yet no other word, no other way, can assure the world's renewal. It is this solution—absorbing as it will the essence of socialism and the reality of democracy—or the present problem of our human life's continuance is insoluble. This solution we must propose and the way thereto follow, or the world is for a long time lost. We must head straight for the kingdom of heaven, or we shall descend into deeper hells than the one wherein we all now blindly flounder: there is no choice, except between these two ways, these two goals. There is no basis for any further human progress except the ground that lies—in the soul of each man and in the soul of the world—between Nazareth and Jerusalem.

XXVIII.

Wherefore I wish that soon, rising from barracks and universities, from factories and farms, the young men and women who are looking for a better peace than Paris, for that fraternal peace which Paris prevented from becoming, would organize themselves into a Young Europe—into the Young Europe which Joseph Mazzini, first and sublimest of international statesmen, so vainly yet valorously essayed. I wish that, clasping hands across the frontiers, the youth of each nation would choose and anoint representatives to meet, either in Rome or Geneva, the chosen and anointed ones of other nations; and that these all, duly assembled and highly determined, would decree, as it would be in their power to do, the end of wars—or the end of the diplomacy through which the Appetites cause the wars to be. I wish, furthermore, that this resolved and consecrate Young Europe, permitting no political party to purloin and exploit its high purpose, would set before the nations the goal, also by Mazzini acclaimed, of universal association in freedom and universal freedom in association—the goal whence the world, ensphered in co-operative and creative good-will, would advance through the years orchestrally, a veritable music of God.

Mr. Palmer Shudders

By ALBERT DE SILVER

WASHINGTON is a very remote place. You never can tell about it. Sometimes it seems as if nothing from the world outside would move it. And at other times its complexion changes almost over night when the news from the rest of the country comes in. It had one of those extraordinary changes about January 12th. Sedition legislation for peace time was the uppermost question just then. The Sterling Bill (S. 3317) had just passed the Senate without a roll-call, and without a quorum present. The handful of its opponents had stood up manfully and said their say—Senators France, Borah, Norris and a few others—but the Senate had made up its mind in advance, and they talked to empty benches. The bill went over to the House the next day and the skids were put under it. Everything was made ready to slide it through. The Judiciary Committee amended it by substituting in its place the Graham Bill, a much more drastic and quite preposterous measure, which went so far as to provide a twenty-year jail sentence for the displaying of any emblem intended to symbolize a purpose to change the Constitution. (Under this clause the agitation for Woman Suffrage would have been seditious.) The Judiciary Committee went to the Rules Committee with a resolution asking for a special rule to provide for the immediate consideration of the bill.

But meanwhile something had happened. The Speaker of the New York Assembly, egged on by the Lusk Committee, had suspended the five Socialist Assemblymen from New York City without specific charges, and in advance of a hearing. A great to-do had arisen about it. Voices all over the country were raised in protest, including those of Mr. Charles E. Hughes, and the New York Bar Association. The statesmen in Washington up on Capitol Hill sat up and rubbed their eyes. They had been taking all this sedition business pretty much on faith, but here was something new. They began to scratch their heads and wondered if they really knew where it all led to. The Rules Committee decided that they had better hold hearings before they granted the special rule.

At this point the Attorney General came into the situation. It seems that Mr. Palmer had come to Chairman Campbell of the Rules Committee on the floor of the House, and requested an opportunity to be heard in favor of the proposed rule. He had asked to be heard first. When the hearing commenced on January 22nd he was not on hand. A

telephone message soon brought word that he was engaged in a conference at the White House, but was sending a letter. In due course the letter, which was dated the previous day, arrived and said that press of official business would prevent his attendance, but that anyway he wasn't in favor of either the Sterling Bill or the Graham Bill. He wanted his own bill which had been introduced by Congressman Davey (H. R. 10650). Immediately the noses of the Republican Congressmen began to twitch. They smelled a rat. They began to wonder whether Mr. Palmer was trying to hand them something that was loaded. The next morning they began talking about the Attorney General having a case of cold feet. That evening the newspapers began to talk too. But still the Attorney General did not appear.

OPPOSITION TO THE BILL

Many others did appear, however. Mr. Samuel Gompers appeared. Prof. Zachariah Chafee, Jr., of Harvard, and Mr. Alfred Bettmann of Cincinnati, who up to last May had been a special United States District Attorney General in charge of sedition prosecutions under the Espionage Act, appeared. And Mr. John D. Moore of New York, Mr. Edward W. Evans of Philadelphia, Captain Swinburne Hale of New York, and others were on hand. They all opposed the bill. They told the Committee that the Federal Criminal Code, which has been on the statute books for many years, was adequate to punish all apostles of violence who ought to be punished. They analyzed the jokers and absurdities in the bill, and they cited historic examples to show that suppression always defeats its own ends. Mr. Moore suggested that quite silent people knew how to make a cross in the proper place to reflect their wishes on election day. Moreover, the Chairman of the Committee had received some three hundred letters and telegrams protesting against the bill. Decidedly this matter was more serious than had been supposed.

After the hearings were over, the Committee took thought and decided to deny the application for the special rule, and the whole subject was sent back to the House Judiciary Committee to be thought over some more.

Then Mr. Palmer appeared again. He asked Chairman Volstead of the Judiciary Committee to give him an opportunity to be heard in support of his bill, the Davey Bill. Attorney General Newton of the State of New York, chief counsel for the

Lusk Committee, also asked for an opportunity to be heard. Mr. Palmer appeared and said pious words about free speech being the crowning glory of a free people. He said that the last thing he wanted to do was to abridge it. He confessed that the Sterling Bill and the Graham Bill made him shudder. He had been loath to appear before the Rules Committee because of this. The cold, it seems, had not been in his feet at all. But his bill, the Davey Bill, was a simple measure. It did not abridge the rights of a free people in the least. It only punished those who advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Mr. Palmer was quite candid. He gave the Committee some examples of the kind of propaganda that he wished to punish. All of them were, for the most part, pieces of silly, superheated talk. One of them mentioned "Economic Direct Action." Congressman Reavis of Nebraska was startled. He didn't seem to think that the advocacy of economic direct action was the same thing as the advocacy of force and violence. He asked the Attorney General about it. Mr. Palmer said that economic direct action meant force and violence, particularly when it was used by the authors of the circular—the I. W. W. Mr. Reavis was unconvinced and inquired whether the phrase would connote force and violence if it had not been used by the I. W. W. Mr. Palmer was not altogether sure about that and reserved decision. Perhaps in the minds of the Committee the colloquy served to bring out in sharp relief the difficulty of deciding what words really amount to "the advocacy of force and violence," and illustrated the danger of giving administrative officials loose terms to play with. At any rate, it was quite clear that the Committee did not believe that the Davey Bill was as simple as Mr. Palmer suggested. They were not greatly impressed with the provision which penalizes with twenty years in prison an "act of hate" against any Federal employee. And I don't believe, either, that they liked the clause which imputes criminality from mere membership in an unlawful association without proof of personal guilt.

Attorney General Newton of New York also appeared and gravely told the Committee that there were between 300,000 and 500,000 persons in the City of New York alone who wanted to overthrow the Government by force and violence. I doubt that anyone believed that his statement was conservative, except, perhaps, Congressman Husted of New York, who comes from Westchester and Rockland Counties, where they like to believe all sorts of things about the wicked city of New York.

There came also before the Judiciary Committee Mr. Francis Fisher Kane, until recently United

States Attorney in Philadelphia, who has just resigned his office because he cannot in good conscience be a part of Mr. Palmer's offensive against the so-called "Red Menace." He gave the Committee the fruits of his personal experience in prosecuting the Reds. He was a witness with first-hand knowledge, and he opposed all peace-time sedition laws. There also appeared against the bills Mr. John D. Moore of New York, Mr. Henry J. Gibbons of Philadelphia and Congressman Huddleston of Alabama.

The Committee thought it over and is still thinking. And now, at the date of writing (February 14th) the whole subject is before the Judiciary Committee and an effective doubt has been raised in the minds of its members. They realize for the first time that peace-time sedition legislation is not as simple a matter as it was supposed to be.

But the fight against it is far from won. My guess is that the Committee at this time still is in favor of some kind of a bill, and that they are likely to try their hands at drafting a brand new measure. They must be made to feel that the sober judgment of the country differs from them. Washington is a remote place. The Congressmen are separated from the minds of their constituents. There is only one way to put them in touch and that is for them to receive letters telling them what the folks back home are really thinking about. Everyone who believes in the soundness of old-fashioned American laws and institutions, and in the ability of the people to progress by orderly means, should write to his own Congressman at once, and tell him that sedition laws for peace time are both unnecessary and vicious. He should also write to Hon. Andrew J. Volstead, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. All of the Congressmen have their offices in the House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

CIVIL LIBERTIES BUREAU REORGANIZED

The American Civil Liberties Union, whose present headquarters are at 138 West 13th St., New York, has been organized to succeed the National Civil Liberties Bureau. It will carry on the work of the Bureau but will give special attention to the maintenance of civil liberties in industrial conflicts. It hopes to build up its work on a nation-wide scale and to that end welcomes support and correspondence from all parts of the country. Its committee of management includes men and women prominent in labor, liberal, and radical movements in the United States. The officers of the Union are:

Chairman: Prof. Harry Ward, of Union Theological Seminary.
 Vice Chairmen: Dunean McDonald, Jeanette Rankin.
 Treasurer: Helen Phelps Stokes.
 Directors: Roger N. Baldwin, Albert DeSilver.

The Chaos of International Finance

SENTIMENT in the United States official and unofficial seems to have settled definitely against any loans to restore industry in Europe. Even the loan for feeding the starving people of Armenia, Austria and Poland has been cut in the House estimate from \$150,000,000 to \$50,000,000 and has not yet been authorized. This action seems to us unworthy of American generosity and makes the more necessary generous gifts—not loans—to such relief agencies as the Committee on Relief in the Near East and the Friends Service Committee. But as regards other and larger loans to European governments we believe that to extend them would be much like throwing good money after bad. Europe will have to work out her own salvation and get rid of governments to which the British expert Mr. Keynes himself advises that no penny be lent. Besides, it is doubtful whether America despite her seeming prosperity is in a position to lend any great sums of real money. The *New York Sun* puts one aspect of our financial situation forcibly in a recent editorial which we quote in full:

In the altogether important annual report of John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency, there is one part of particular gravity. It is his reminder and warning to the American people and to the world of falsely and dangerously deluding themselves as to the economic worth of what they are doing with their opportunities and their energies. It is his analysis of the true value of the production and trade expressed in billions of dollars that nowadays trip so lightly off the tongue of the captain of industry or the day laborer. He shows a bread and butter danger signal.

It is true, as the Comptroller says, but it is a truth wantonly ignored, that there is more wealth for the nation and for the world in 40,000,000 tons of steel at a low price than in 30,000,000 tons at a high price. There is more heat and light and power for mankind in a ton of coal at \$2 than in half a ton at \$100. There is more food in a bushel of potatoes at a niggardly price than in a peck of potatoes at the price of pearls.

Too much of what we count as wealth production in these days is more empty dollar marks than solid substance. Coal in abundance can work for us; beef and wheat and potatoes in abundance can feed us; dollar marks cannot. We can paint them on a loaf of bread with figures rising in geometrical progression, but if we mark the five cent loaf up to a dollar loaf there never will be a single bite more of bread in the loaf. All these necessities we can get surely with physical work, never with mathematical gymnastics.

The world has been swept with the delirium of trying to get the necessities of life out of a paint pot—smearing penny prices off our goods and daubing on dimes; smearing out dollar bills and daubing five dollar bills on our wages; smearing out millions and daubing billions on our national production—without labor delivering the work, industry producing the goods and nations amassing the wealth.

On any such basis of economic lunacy as that we never can restore the war's immeasurable destruction of wealth. We never can regain the solid prosperity of good living and essential savings. We can only whirl along to the inevitable end of national want, in-

ternational destitution and economic sterility as of fields and gardens blasted by a thunderbolt from the skies.

Meanwhile foreign exchange has reached a new low-water mark. Not one of the European monetary systems is on a gold basis, and their mutual relations are almost hopelessly tangled. American foods have been shipped back from European ports because Europe had nothing wherewith to pay. Our fool's paradise of war prosperity is ending. Mr. H. P. Davison of the House of Morgan on his departure for Europe cryptically declared that history would be made in Wall Street before his return. It is fairly certain that before many months we shall pass through sobering and painful days. If we are wise the experience may point the way to a radical reconstruction of our economic order and the more intelligent and cooperative use of our vast natural resources.

The N. Y. Legislature on Trial

THE progress of the hearing before the Assembly Judiciary Committee at Albany makes it increasingly clear that not the five Socialist Assemblymen, not the Socialist Party, but representative institutions are on trial. So far, as most of the newspaper correspondents have admitted, the proceedings have been marked by an obvious lack of fairness. Mr. Littleton's opening speech against the Assemblymen has been mailed out wholesale by Speaker Sweet to public school teachers. Who pays for this kind of campaign? All sorts of evidence has been admitted which on the face of it was irrelevant and abusive. A Brooklyn girl gave romantic testimony about how, at a street meeting in the early days of the war, Assemblyman Charles Solomon spat on the American flag. That Mr. Solomon still lives is the best refutation of the story. Mr. Peter J. Collins testified that Socialism was inconsistent with God, morality, and the home. He spoke as an ardent Catholic. But a wiser man than he, and an equally good Catholic, Father Ryan, who debated against Morris Hillquit some years ago, wrote to his former opponent to protest against the unseating of the Socialist legislators. He pointed out that what the New York Legislature did to the Socialists because they did not like them, the Georgia legislature might some time do to the Catholics. It is certainly true that the Catholic allegiance to the Pope is at least as strong as the Socialist allegiance to the Third Internationale. We think Socialists and Catholics might well make common cause against the dangerous doctrine that loyalty to the country means blind worship of the state. Written on the monument of one of New York's early Governors is a Latin motto which declares: "Dear is the Fatherland, but dearer is liberty." Would Speaker Sweet and his supporters regard the motto as seditious? Or will even they agree that he does not really love his country who does not give primary allegiance to freedom?

Religion's Limitations

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR

THE Christian church deceives itself in believing that the revival of religious sentiment during the war, together with the prestige which the church secured by its ministries of kindness to the men in the army, will secure it that glorious destiny of prestige and power which religious leaders are so confidently and so unanimously predicting. All its priestly ministries will not reconcile the world to the failure of the church in its prophetic function, its failure to guide the conscience of the nations. With but few exceptions the voice of the pulpit was too strident and its passions gravitated very easily to the vindictive passions of the crowd. It failed to maintain even a vestige of its professed internationalism which other agencies of like profession tried so desperately to maintain and the dictates of its conscience were hardly ever unique enough to be distinguished from the dictates of national expediency.

Some of the thoughtful leaders of the church have been free to admit its shortcomings but even these fail to realize the fundamental nature of its weakness and invariably attribute it to incidental causes while they continue to assert their confidence in its destiny as the agency of every salvation. Practically every statement of church leaders since the conclusion of the war contains some modern equivalent of the ancient dictum "Extra ecclesia nulla salus." This assertion and this confidence in the complete sovereignty of religion over morality is precisely what this war has challenged. It has proven the power of religion over morality to be less absolute and its interest in morality to be more divided than the church has traditionally assumed.

No one could deny religion a tremendous power over moral life. Its motives are powerful incentives of moral action and its assurances valuable allies in the moral struggle. Religion creates a world in which morality has meaning; but it is not as exclusively the agent of moral progress as it pretends to be. In its relation to morality it is subject to distinct limitations, chief among which is its inability to direct and apply the righteous motives which it inspires. Genuine religion sensitizes the conscience, but without proper guidance a sensitive conscience may express itself very narrowly and very absurdly. For this reason the moral life of religious believers is generally not as unique as they suppose it to be. All the influences and passions, sentiments and prejudices that play upon the lives of other men, direct the action and determine the

morality of religious believers. They may desire justice more fervently than most men but with the rest of the world they must wait upon the gradual development of moral insight and the slow processes of moral experience for its realization.

This inability of religion to direct moral impulses as successfully as it develops them partly accounts for the interest of the church in personal rather than in social and political morality, which is a primary cause of its failure during the war. The problems of personal morality are fairly simple. In these religion succeeds in enforcing its unique demands and maintains the morality of its faithful some degrees higher than the average. While organized religion is generally indifferent to new and unique standards of morality it does succeed in enforcing the common morality to an uncommon degree. But in problems of social and political morality, moral purpose does not find the same easy guidance and the morality of the church becomes immediately less distinctive. The more complex moral problems are, the more is religion at the mercy of popular prejudices and passions. The church has espoused the temperance cause more enthusiastically than economic reform and has castigated the card player and gambler more mercilessly than the national imperialist and has evinced a greater concern for the morality of the soldier than for the ideals of the statesman, because religious sentiment finds its easiest and most immediate expression in personal morality. The morality of the church is puritanical, principally because the church persists in the narrow field of purely individual morality. Puritanism is moral purpose fretting itself in a too narrow field. The church persists there principally because in the larger field of national and political morality it is perplexed with many problems that it can not understand and for the solution of which religious leaders do not possess the proper equipment.

The unreflective belligerency of our churches during the war, which liberals find it so hard to forgive, was caused to a great extent by its ignorance of the complexities of international morality. Without the authority of superior knowledge the church was betrayed into a policy of abject servility to popular and official opinion. Our pulpits contributed very little on the whole to the task of fashioning the aims of the war in the interest of a new international morality. Their failure may have been partly due to that excess of passion that comes

so easily to religion and in part it may have also been caused by an insincere bargaining for public favor; yet its chief cause was not insincerity but naïveté in the complexities of international morality. Every imperialist was able to fool the church in the name of patriotism and every apostle of national selfishness was able to take it in with pretensions of noble sentiment. It needed little prompting to conceive the war, as the man in the street conceived it, in terms of the melodrama, glossing over the sins of the hero and wishing the villain in perdition. Not because it lacked sincerity but because it wanted wordly wisdom was the church so often made the unwitting mouthpiece of reactionary sentiment.

WARMTH, NOT LIGHT, FROM THE CHURCH

The tendency of religion to create rather than apply moral purpose and enthusiasm was manifest in history before this war. Though always worshipping the highest ideals organized religion has never been a conspicuous force in any specific step of moral progress. Serfdom was abolished without its aid and it failed to anticipate the conscience of mankind on the slavery question. With the rise of industrialism and the consequent shift of emphasis from a purely personal to a social morality the church discarded its individual and other-worldly morality no faster than an enlightened public opinion forced that course upon it; and while it is now preaching the "social gospel" with sincere conviction the average pulpit is still out of touch with the problems of modern industry and indifferent to its wrongs of which there is no better proof than its recent ambition to be regarded an enemy of "bolshivism" rather than a foe of reaction. The church is anxious to create enthusiasm for a better world, for the "Kingdom of God," but seems hampered by many limitations in applying that enthusiasm in any specific crisis or for any particular end.

Perhaps this is not a very telling criticism against the church and religion inasmuch as it could be maintained that it is contributing its share to moral progress if it succeeds in arousing the moral will, the desire for righteousness even if it leaves the task of applying that power to other institutions. But it certainly ought to discount some of the extravagant pretensions of the church. Mankind will always be in need of more moral purpose and good will. The very task of abolishing war may be largely a matter of creating a more overwhelming desire that it be abolished. And yet it seems that the world needs light even more than good-will and love, and enlightenment even more than regeneration. The memorandum on the war aims of the Inter-Allied Labor conference closes with a plea for

more "warmth in politics and much less apathetic acquiescence in the miseries that exist" but asserts that "the Labor party has no belief in any problems of the world being solved by good-will alone. . . . Especially in the complexities of politics the Labor party stands for increased study." . . . It is because the church produces warmth rather than light that it has been so impotent "especially in the complexities of politics." Moral progress results from the development of moral insight rather than from the accumulation of moral purpose because men have always had more of the latter than they had knowledge to apply. The emotional and volitional element in morality has been a fairly constant factor in history, and progress has come by development of the rational which fashioned new engines to utilize the heretofore dissipated power of man's moral purpose. We surpass our fathers not in the sincerity of our moral purpose but in the keenness of our moral insight and our children will in turn surpass us not in love but in knowledge. For this reason religion can never be the sole agent of moral progress though it will remain a powerful force in moral life.

Not only is the influence of religion upon morality less absolute but its interest in morality is less sustained than it assumes. There are factors in religion that inevitably beguile it into an indifference toward moral problems. The poorly disguised apostasy of the church from the ethics of Jesus during the war and its failure to be guided by principles which it ostensibly regards as revealed finality can be explained only if we can appreciate how easily religion may lose interest in specific moral problems and achievements. Religion never completely loses, and periodically it returns with enthusiasm to, the conviction that only moral victory can give man that abundance of life which is its principal concern. But meanwhile it can never quite overcome the temptation of giving man comfort and peace by the magic of the ritual or the purely subjective mystical experience. The priest is the permanent type of religious leader. The prophet dominates religion only periodically and makes its moral interest as supreme as it claims it always to be. Inevitably he is succeeded by the priest who capitalizes the prophet's achievement so that others may appropriate his victory without fighting his battles. It seems in fact to be the chief concern of priests of every age to make the heroism of one generation last for many. Gradually history is giving the prophet a permanent ascendancy over the priest but it is not as complete as religion supposes. Modern religion, modern protestant Christianity to be specific, has more priestly elements within it than it is conscious of. The Ref-

ormation was a struggle between mystic and ritualist rather than between prophet and priest and was too Pauline to be truly prophetic. It did not obviate the danger that religion should give men an unearned and undeserved peace. Perhaps it ought to be a principal concern of religion to give men that final peace that comes through the assurance of pardon. "We are not intended to succeed. Failure is the fate allotted to all men," says Robert Louis Stevenson. What men crave for most in religion is the assurance that this failure need not end disastrously for them; that by the grace of God our uncompleted lives will somehow be completed and our defeat turned into some kind of ultimate victory. It is inevitable, however, that religion should, in the pursuance of this task, encourage many to appropriate the comfort of this assurance prematurely and illegitimately, before and without deserving it. This is not an incidental but a constitutional limitation of religion.

In a sense the war revealed not so much the failure of Christianity as this constitutional limitation of religion. The task of the Christian church is by eternal vigilance to preserve the prophetic heritage which Christ gave his religion against the inevitable gravitation toward priestly unconcern for morality inherent in religion itself. The church, far from being the sole agent of moral progress, will have only a negligible influence in the swiftly moving course of modern history if it does not lose some of its complacent confidence in its divinely appointed destiny and try more sincerely to achieve the moral leadership to which it lays claim. Religion will always be a force in morality, for it can never completely renounce, even though it cannot always maintain, its interest in and influence over morality. But it will not be a potent force in this new day if it will not acquire the grace of humility and recognize its own limitations in the moral struggle.

A Defense of Capitalism

BY ONE OF ITS FRIENDS

THE capitalistic age is not closing; it has barely come to dawn. Whatever the origins of the late war, its issue was obviously a gigantic victory for capitalism. In all the Western countries, before the war, capitalism and government were at loggerheads; today their love affair is so touching that it must melt the hardest heart. Observe what has happened here in the United States. Six years ago it was the fashionable thing to flirt with radicalism; the land swarmed with parlor Socialists; all sorts of ultra-democratic schemes were in the air. Today it is almost worth a free citizen's liberty to be caught reading Marx, or to express the opinion that Debs has been in jail long enough, or to argue that even a Russian Jew deserves to be given his day in court, confronted by his accusers, before he is deported to God knows where, or clubbed by the police, or murdered in cold blood by mine guards. All the complex machinery for harassing those who opposed the war is now converted into an engine for punishing the foes of capital. A man suspected of having designs on capitalism is quite without any rights in our law. He is denied the use of the mails. Bar associations exhort their members to refuse to represent him when he is accused. He may be thrown into jail without any intelligible legal process, and kept there at the pleasure of his jailers. No newspaper will print his defense. He is deprived of the rights of petition of free speech and of lawful assemblage. His domicile is not inviolable. His private papers may be pawed through by any government detective who is inclined to take the trouble. He has no standing whatever in law or equity. And yet there are Red optimists, and one hears that the Revolution is set for day after tomorrow!

A gypsy tells me that I shall live to be eighty-six. I expect to die under capitalism, and to see a Jew President of the United States before I die. Jacob H. Schiff is too old and Otto H. Kahn was born in Germany, but it will be some member of the same imperial line—not a Bolshevik Jew out of Grand Street, but a respectable Protestant Episcopal Jew out of Wall Street. If his first name is not Irving, then his last name will be Noblestone or Rosehill. I shall, of course, vote for him. I tire of voting for mountebanks; before I die I want to vote for at least one genuinely intelligent man. For intelligence will survive and prevail, as it always survives and prevails. The common man is an incurable idiot. If the time ever comes when capitalism can't hold him in check by force, it will hold him in check by chicanery. That new time, indeed, already casts its shadows before. The boob nibbles at the predestined bait. Capitalism convinces him, so easily that it is laughable, that its enemies are also his enemies—that all of them, at bottom, are the secret agents of foreign demons, yesterday the Kaiser and today Lenin, and so bent upon busting the Republic, overturning civilization, grabbing his Ford and his phonograph, burning down his house, and ravishing his wife. The spectacle is really stupendous. How any sane man can remain a so-called Liberal in the face of it is more than I can make out. As for me, I enjoy the show to the full. Inasmuch as all of my private interests are on the side of capitalism, I am honestly in favor of capitalism. What delights me is the sight of imbeciles whooping for it whose interests are all on the other side. It is as if rats should form bodyguards to protect cats.

H. L. MENCKEN in the February *Smart Set*.

Ethics for Stockholders

LAST month we printed the following Declaration for Stockholders:

We, the undersigned, in view of our responsibility as stockholders and beneficiaries through shares in corporations, feel compelled to state our conviction:

1. That the first charge on industry should be the adequate and honorable compensation of those engaged in it.

2. That the ultimate control in industry should pass from the owners of capital to those who work by hand or brain.

Insofar as we may have power or influence we will use it to carry this belief into effect in the determination of questions concerning wages and working conditions in those companies in which we hold stock. Furthermore we will seek and support such reorganization of industry as will promote the highest good both of the workers and of the community at large, even though it may mean the ultimate disappearance of any separate class of shareholders, and we are prepared to accept such personal loss as may arise from this process of reorganization. We invite the cooperation of all stockholders to this end.

All who are willing to sign the above statement or have comment to make on it are asked to communicate with The World Tomorrow.

We go to press too early this month to have received numerous replies from our readers, or even to tabulate and discuss the interesting letters which we are receiving on the subject of this statement. We shall make a more complete report in a later issue. For the present we should like to repeat in reply to some questions that we are fully aware that no such declaration as we propose will in itself solve the problems of our modern industrial system. We do think that it may give invaluable evidence of a spirit of good will and desire for cooperation in the solution of those problems.

One letter which we have received gives certain suggestions to stockholders which we are sure will interest our readers. We quote it in full.

Your "Challenge to Stockholders" is an important step in the right direction. It is precisely by impressing upon investors their immediate responsibility as actual owners of labor-employing corporations that we can hope to translate the inert goodwill of many friends into action. All you have asked is an expression of opinion. May I suggest a few lines of practical action which may interest your recruits?

1. Visit the office and plant of the company in which you hold stock. Find out for yourself what its policy is toward labor; how it treats its employees; what their attitude is toward the company. Make suggestions yourself for improvements and see that they reach responsible officials. Coming from a stockholder, you may be sure that they will receive attention. Incidentally you will get acquainted with the managers and their business methods and will learn a great deal about the real value of your investment.

2. Never give a proxy. Attend all stockholders' meetings personally; ask questions; offer resolutions; vote the way you think right and see that a proper record is kept of what takes place. You will find that mere publicity is a very powerful agent. Nobody likes to be put on record as deliberately pursuing a policy that is wrong or even merely mean and obstinate.

3. Confine your investments to corporations so situated

ated that you can visit them. Above all avoid holding companies. They accentuate the evils of absentee ownership, because they have themselves no direct connection with operation. They are themselves only stockholders and their only use ordinarily is to facilitate the financial control of some small group of moneyed men who do not wish the public to be able to inquire too particularly about the actual earnings and spendings of the operating companies.

Stockholders have important rights which they seldom exercise as individuals. They can for instance examine the records of the corporation. They can in this way find out who the other stockholders are, and can bring together those who have common views. They can appeal directly to the ignorant and indifferent among them. They can get an expression of opinion which even if it proves to be that of a small minority will have an immense weight with the public in case of a strike. It puts the directors in rather a ridiculous position to defend unfair methods in behalf of the stockholders for whom they are "trustees" when their beneficiaries repudiate their policy.

Manufacturing, selling and ordinary business corporations of moderate capitalization will, I believe, respond quite readily to efforts of stockholders to assure a correct labor policy. Even the great industrial are susceptible, as Mr. Cabot's appeal to the United States Steel Corporation showed. That no other stockholders of that company made themselves heard during the recent strike is a matter that each must settle with his own conscience. Public service corporations stand on a somewhat different footing on account of their legal restrictions in some directions and supervision in others. They are not so free to pursue their own policy or to listen to their stockholders. Unless you know that you can make yourself felt in the management of the company, it would be better ethics (and at the same time perfectly good finance) not to invest in stock of public service corporations.

HORACE A. DAVIS.

Postponing the Inevitable

RESUMPTION of trade relations with Soviet Russia makes slower progress than we had hoped. The Allies have been going through a lot of diplomatic backing and filling, partly in a ludicrous effort to save their face; partly because of the continuing conflict between Lloyd George's policy of "killing Bolshevism by trade" and the French policy (represented in the British cabinet by Winston Churchill) of killing it by armies—mostly subsidized armies, Polish and the like. Lloyd George seems to be winning. If Britain wants trade, it behooves the rest of the world to step lively or be rather badly left—a point of view which has not yet dawned upon our State Department. A convention of American manufacturers and merchants, however, has grasped the point. Among the leaders of this movement are the packers; sure proof that the desire for an understanding with Russia has passed the stage either of revolutionary sympathy or humanitarianism!

The Cooperative Congress at Chicago

The Cooperative Congress at Chicago may be far more significant for the future than the conventions of the two great parties this summer. We are glad, therefore, to give to our readers this extended report of its proceedings.

IT was perhaps significant that the first All-American Farmer-Labor Cooperative Congress should commence its sessions on Lincoln's birthday and should be held in the magnificent Labor Temple built by the street car men of Chicago. Nearly five hundred delegates representing the farmers and laborers of over half the states in the union took an active part in the three days of continuous meetings. It was as interesting an American crowd as has ever convened together. One could not help being impressed by the combination of hard-headed business and an almost religious idealism which predominated the conference. Long-bearded farmers, citified trade unionists, and a smattering of women met together with a common purpose. It was not a group of young people or of fanatics each with his own idea of how the world should be run. The average age of the delegates must have been between forty and forty-five; simple, thoughtful people in dead earnest and fired with the ideal of the cooperative movement.

Significant to the labor movement at this time, too, was the presence of such men as Warren S. Stone, Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who was one of the presiding officers; Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Duncan McDonald, President of the Illinois State Federation of Labor; and Glenn E. Plumb. The object of the conference was clearly set forth by C. H. Gustafson, President of the Congress. A farmer himself, with the mien of a Quaker, he typified in his quiet strength, his simplicity and earnestness the spirit of the entire group of delegates.

"This conference" he said, "is to be confined to cooperation alone. Pet schemes and party politics have no part in these discussions. True cooperation is nearer solving the economic questions of today than any other remedy. The farmers have long been told by the special interests not to mix up with laborers. Our object must be to get together. Cooperators believe that we should recognize the human being in preference to the dollar. This is the difference between the cooperative and the capitalist theory. The purpose of this meeting, therefore, is to gather the best plans for furthering cooperation in the United States."

The conducting of cooperative undertakings in America has been generally supposed by a misinformed public to have been a dead failure. It is true that probably as many cooperatives have failed as have succeeded. But today there are three thousand cooperative enterprises in the United States operating on a successful basis and for the most part on the Rochdale plan. These range all the way from the retail grocery in a small town to

cooperatively owned grain elevators, lumber mills, slaughter houses, factories, banks, and insurance companies. Nine different groups of cooperative societies are at present operating separately and independently of one another, representing sometimes the enterprise of one trade union craft such as the factory of the Maintenance of Way and Shop Employees at Cleveland; sometimes the federated interests of farmers' groups in several states such as that of the Equity Cooperative Exchange with offices in St. Paul; and finally the interests of consumers everywhere as typified by the retail and wholesale stores of the National Cooperative Association, spreading from coast to coast. To federate these nine groups under one permanent governing commission, to strengthen and standardize them was pre-eminently the meaning of President Gustafson's "get together."

Although the laws of some states make it impossible to use the Rochdale plan by requiring that each share of stock obligates one vote, the Congress unanimously favored this system based on the long and successful experience of English and Russian cooperators. The Rochdale plan works on the following democratic principles: (1) One vote only to each member, regardless of the number of shares held. (2) Legal rate of interest only, allowed on shares of capital stock. (3) All buying and selling, retail or wholesale, to be for cash—no credit given or accepted, as far as possible—making any financial failure practically impossible. (4) Profits on purchases returned to members according to amount of patronage. Furthermore, the individual holding of a large amount of stock is discouraged in order that the interest of the undertaking may be spread among as large a number of people as possible.

Although there were many speeches on many phases of the cooperative movement, the three outstanding needs which were presented in a most thoughtful and practical manner were those of finance, education, and the press. Frederick C. Howe, ex-Commissioner of Immigration and at present a member of the Commission on Democratic Railroad Control, who was introduced by Warren S. Stone as being the best authority on cooperative banking in the country, said: "Banking is possible because there are always more people who deposit money than there are who borrow. The German peasants put their savings in a common fund. When some one of them needs a new tool or wants to buy some land he borrows from the common fund. This system of banking for mutual aid is the system of the state banks of North Dakota. It is the system of five thousand banks in Japan and of sixty-five thousand banks in the world, for the most part conducted by ignorant people. Banking for use is as simple and natural a matter as any other daily affair of life. It is banking for profit which becomes so involved."

As I. V. Sherman of the Moscow People's Bank said in describing Russian Cooperatives, "Banking for the people is a perfectly intelligible thing. But it becomes a very hard and complicated matter when it is necessary to water stock and furnish loans to bankrupt countries."

Banking is so concentrated today that the people's money is used for their own exploitation rather than for their use. Free banking was once encouraged in the United States. But today it is controlled by a few people. Credit to artisans based on their integrity is no longer possible except under the Morris Plan. Cooperative enterprises have often failed because of the opposition of banking interests. Farmers and laborers are not able under the existing conditions to secure adequate credit for productive undertakings. In order to safeguard the financial end of cooperative effort a new system of cooperative banking is needed to serve the producing people, a system easily understood, sound, and in conformity with the law. Mr. Howe recommended that instead of one central bank being instituted it would be better that several should start with a small capital of from \$250,000 to \$500,000, subscribed for instance by the members of a railway brotherhood. Dividends should be limited so that the capital stock can be increased. And in addition to limiting the dividends and distributing the stock widely, provisions should be made for disposing of the surplus, which could be devoted to propaganda and educational purposes in cooperative banking. The surplus over this should be divided between the depositors and the borrowers.

"In Denmark," Mr. Howe stated, "there are two hundred and fifty thousand farmers, two hundred and forty thousand of whom are in cooperatives. There the meat packers run the government because they are the farmers." (At which point a delegate asked, "The meat-packers run the government here too, don't they?") "The banks must come back into the hands of the people. It isn't the money cooperation is going to save us. It's the life it is going to give us."

In connection with the plan of the cooperative banks came the report of F. A. Rust, Secretary-Manager of the Trades Union Bank of Seattle. The history of the bank dates back only a year. The Labor Union Temple had recently been built, and Mr. Rust conceived the idea of a Trade Union Bank for the savings of union men to carry the debt of the temple. The bank opened its doors March 1, 1919. January, 1920, saw a sum total of \$521,000 in deposits. Every man who puts money in the bank becomes automatically a stockholder. Interest is divided up every six months among the depositors on the basis of the amount of money deposited and the length of time it has been deposited. No checking accounts are carried. But no notice is required for withdrawals, and partial withdrawals are allowed. Mr. Rust recommended that in connection with the cooperative movement a number of national banks should be started, members of the federal reserve, so that they should be wholly independent of other national banks. A national bank has the confidence of the people and is a substantial financial institution.

The entire conference was unanimous in its

eagerness regarding the immediate establishment of a people's press throughout the country. Farmers and laborers alike were keenly aware of the condition of the capitalist newspapers and the necessity of controlling their own press in order that the truth might be presented to the people. E. B. Ault, Editor of the *Seattle Union Record*, Robert M. Buck, Editor of *The New Majority*, organ of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and Walter M. Leggett representing the Non-Partisan League papers of North Dakota, voiced the opinion of the Congress in their statements that newspapers today were the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of progress in the United States.

THE CORRUPTION OF JOURNALISM

Mr. Leggett asserted that journalism is no longer a profession but a business run for profit. No profession is so utterly degraded today as the press. He stated that there were thirty thousand daily, weekly, and monthly papers in America at the present time with a circulation of fifty-six million. Fourteen million daily papers are issued every day and are read on an average by thirty million people. These are the same people who carry on our industrial, educational, and political life. First impressions are gathered from the headlines of papers. Misinformation, he said, has been made an exact science. Ninety per cent of the cost of publishing capitalist newspapers is paid for by the advertisers. Who pays the fiddler calls the tune. The press is therefore prostituted to its advertisers. Department stores, which are the largest advertisers, are dependent on bankers for credit, so that it is ultimately a small group of financiers who control the policy of the "kept press." The press cannot be freed by relying on philanthropy. Newspapers must be cooperatively owned in order to belong to the people. They should be inter-related with a common purpose, and should be financially supported by their readers. Mr. Leggett presented a well-worked-out plan, on the basis of the North Dakota Non-Partisan League enterprises which run a cooperative magazine and newspapers in fifty-three counties, for establishing immediately a central people's press bureau to promote daily papers in all centers.

Robert Buck told of the unique history of *The New Majority* which started thirteen months ago, financially assisted by the Chicago Federation of Labor, without stock or advertising. After several months of running a deficit, in its eleventh month its revenue was \$300 higher than its expenses, and it has continued to expand financially simply on its circulation without dividends, interests or profits. He told also of the birth of the Federated Press, serving all labor papers, and of its proposed development to compete with the Associated and United Press services, with picture and feature service. The problem of securing newsprint paper for those labor and farmer papers which are printing the truth has recently become a life-and-death matter. For this reason a paper company has been formed within the last week by members of the Federated Press and negotiations for buying a paper mill to be run cooperatively are now taking place. "We need no better propaganda for progress," Mr. Buck

stated, "than the truth ably and fearlessly presented in newspapers."

The place of educational work in the cooperative movement was considered to be of supreme importance not only in stabilizing the movement but in increasing its spirit, its efficiency, and a wider comprehension of the cooperative idea. James P. Warbasse, President of the Cooperative League of America, who has already done pioneer work in this country in bringing to people the experience of the English, Russian, and Scandinavian movements, presented to the Congress a very definite plan of procedure to increase the life of co-operation here. "There are thirty-two different reasons why societies were dying in the United States," Mr. Warbasse declared. "Every one of these can be traced back to one fundamental cause—the lack of cooperative education."

Mr. Warbasse's plan included the making use of experts already in the cooperative movement and putting them into larger fields of action. He would divide the country into perhaps ten districts each with an advisor who would know store management, book-keeping and auditing. The duties of such an advisor would be to familiarize himself with all the cooperative enterprises in his field, to make himself available to the district, to meet with groups and not only help to start new societies but to assist in keeping them from going to the wall. He would be responsible for helping to organize entertainments and educational committees. He would lend his aid in setting on foot accessory undertakings such as laundries, for a real cooperator must be forever thinking of new fields. There should be a central educational organization for training cooperators with opportunity for field work. The final report of the educational committee included the suggestions of Dr. Warbasse and emphasized the need of training cooperative membership through newspapers, magazines and discussion groups.

The last day of the Congress was devoted entirely to the reports of the various Committees. A permanent nation-wide Commission was created to coordinate and build up cooperative effort among producers and consumers. The new Commission is to include the following departments: Education, Organization, Transportation, Insurance, Business, Standardization, Legislation, Finance and Press. A resolution was adopted to hold succeeding Congresses on the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday.

The reports of some of the Committees reveal the sense of the Congress regarding other phases of the Cooperative movement. The Committee on Uniformity and Standardization suggested standardization of stores in appearance, delivery system, trade mark for cooperative goods, accounting and bookkeeping, and arrangement of stock. A recommendation from the floor was added to the report favoring the purchase of union-made goods wherever practicable. The Committee on Legislation recommended the passage of a national, model incorporated cooperative law in order that the Rochdale system may operate in all states. A recommendation for a blanket law for the public ownership of railroads met with considerable disapproval and was finally amended so that it was

the sense of the meeting that the principles of the Plumb Plan for public ownership of the railroads be adopted. The Committee on Women contended that the success of the cooperative movement depended on the equal representation and equal responsibility of women. Among its recommendations was one for direct trading between cooperative selling groups of farm women and cooperative buying groups of city women in communities where no cooperative store had yet been organized. The report of the Committee on Cooperative Production was a forward look into the future democratic control of industry by the workers. The suggestion was made that a cooperative factory be established as soon as possible as an experimental station for trying out new methods of management of production. The Committee on Direct Trading recommended the immediate appointment of a commission to draw up a plan for safeguarding all organizations now in operation. It was also brought out by various speakers during the meetings that the ideal of improving, standardizing and making secure the three thousand cooperative enterprises at present in operation was more important now than the starting of new undertakings.

A poster which faced the delegates during the meetings symbolized the hope which everyone felt. A reproduction of the Statue of Liberty stood in the middle, and on either side was the figure of a farmer and the figure of a laborer, clasping hands as a confirmation of their freedom and of that larger brotherhood, set on a fundamental basis, which has been created out of the present crisis.

Real Americanism Wins in Washington

THE House of Representatives has decisively defeated the attempts of the imperialists to Prussianize the youth of America. Mr. Mondell and other Republican leaders have rejected universal military training and service on the ground of its huge expense; the Democratic caucus has made opposition to compulsory training a party policy, and this in the face of the President's advice to the contrary. Since the conscience of Congress in these matters is determined by a process of affixing the ear firmly to the ground, we may safely assume that in the action of leaders of both parties in the House we have a pretty fair index measure of sound American opposition to the attempt to foist upon us the very sort of militarism the war was ostensibly fought to defeat. The only danger is that old fashioned Americanism, having won this victory, will relax its vigilance.

The rich and powerful militaristic interests are far from crushed and will continue their campaign both in Congress and the state legislatures. They have the aid of those ex-pacifists Messrs. Wilson and Baker, and the majority of the Military Affairs Committees, both in the Senate and the House. Thanks to these committees conscription bills are before both houses of Congress. The passage of either of them would not only militarize America, but invite other nations to a new and disastrous competition in armaments.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

How Russia Treats Conscientious Objectors

I FAIL to agree with your comment in your January issue that Lenin's decree on Conscientious Objectors "is a decided advance on the theory and on the practice of our own government."—"The proclamations of the President and the Secretary of War are in substance practically the same as those of Soviet Russia.—How they have worked out here in "practice" we all know.

Section I of the Soviet decree, exempts those with "religious convictions . . . on the finding of a national tribunal" and the condition that they shall perform "service of public utility at the option of the said persons."

The above assumes, that only those of "religious convictions," have the right to refuse to commit murder.

A person who cannot prove that he believes in any of the accepted forms of religion, who cannot show that he belongs to any sect, but who only happens to be a normal being, sincerely believing that the "golden rule," which no form of religion can claim as specifically its own, is about as workable a proposition as he is able to find, and putting that, to the test of his ability, into practice, refuses to take part in any form of organized or unorganized murder—where does he stand?

Failing to satisfactorily prove his "religious convictions" by the spoken or written word, he is judged as insincere by a group of men who have no more right to pass judgment upon whether his innermost convictions are right or wrong, sincere or otherwise, than he has to pass upon their convictions.

If conscription is wrong here, it is wrong there, and a proclamation, no matter how expeditiously worded, cannot do away with the fundamental principle.

As it is, the Soviet decree follows closely in substance and intent the exemption clauses in both of the British conscription acts and the proclamations of our President and Secretary of War. Have we any authentic material on which to base the opinion that there "is a decided advance . . . on the practice of our own government" in the treatment of those Soviet Russian CO's who were unable to have their sincerity vouched for by the "United Council of Moscow Religious Groups and Communities"; who did not have any one to "bear witness to the sincerity and honesty of the person to be exempted" (who, in fact, disdained such a procedure as a degradation); and who refused to accept "any other service of public utility at the option of said persons" as a proof of their sincerity?

CHARLES SPENCER.

Chicago, Illinois.

The Bolshevik decree in respect to conscientious objectors is an advance on the American in two respects: (1) under certain circumstances it provides for total exemption, which was never provided for in America; (2) it provides that an outside agency has the right to make a request for the exemption of conscientious objectors. This is something the American law and practice do not permit; and is a very valuable recognition by the state of the existence of non-political organizations. As to the objection that the decree provides only for religious objectors, that is met in practice by allowing the Tolstoyan Society to look after the individual objector not connected with any particular religious body. We make this statement on the authority of Isaac Don Levine, best informed of Russian correspondents. He adds that many objectors

were subjected to outrages in places removed from the centers of Soviet authority, and continues, "Prison treatment in itself is not bad in Soviet Russia. It is the preliminary detention places that are abhorrent in many cases. Of course, cold-blooded torture is a condition entirely unknown to Russian prisons. After being sentenced, the prisoner is safer and more comfortable than ever before in Russia. The reverse is true of the period of detention preceding trial."

Unfortunately, cold-blooded torture of political prisoners is not a rare event in the United States.

The Ethics of Strikes

WILL you be so kind as to enlighten me on your attitude regarding the "strike" as commonly known?

The writer is a wage-earner involved in union activities and non-placed by the radical differences of opinion about the labor strike.

Is the strike to end strikes as contradictory as the war to end war?

Is it coercion in an evil sense and profoundly wrong, as, for instance, the practice of physical violence?

An answer from you will be eagerly awaited.

E. A. B.

New York City.

This is one of several requests that THE WORLD TOMORROW discuss the ethics of the strike. We hope to publish a discussion or symposium on the subject in the near future. Meanwhile the editor desires to answer rather dogmatically that the strike properly used seems to him to be a legitimate form of what is sometimes called passive resistance; that in its spiritual and social consequences it is not analogous to war, but rather is an illustration of a method of resistance to evil which may under certain circumstances be substituted for war. THE WORLD TOMORROW will welcome correspondence on this subject.

Craft vs. Industrial Unionism

THE situation in Great Britain at the moment is one of great complexity. 50,000 iron molders have been on strike for nearly four months and the engineering trade is gradually being paralyzed. The Trade Union Congress is about to intervene in the matter because the old industrial issue has been raised in connection with the strike, namely, the right of a General Laborers' Union to organize skilled workers. In this connection I ought to say that the Workers' Union has within its fold a goodly number of skilled iron molders employed at Birmingham, and the Employers' Federation is delaying a settlement of the national dispute because of that local difficulty. This dispute raises once again the question of the basis of Labor unionism in this country. I am one of those who believe that Trade Unionism ought to be based on the conception that man works to satisfy his human needs and not merely because he employs certain tools at his work. That is to say, the man is greater than the tools he employs in the workshop. Strict craft unionism determines otherwise and declares unconsciously that the lathe, for instance, is more important than the engineer who works it. A good description of the situation would be, the craft unionist is the Catholic and the industrial unionist the Protestant in labor organization.

R. J. D.

Manchester, England, January, 1920.

Americanization in the Public Schools

HAVE you seen the latest bit of news on the progress of "Americanization" in the schools? The Bryant High School of Long Island City, enrolment 3500 students, has adopted the following school song:

Don't you think some people in our land have talked enough?
Don't you think the time has come to call their little bluff?
Ask them what's the matter, make them can the chatter.
Then proceed to make the party rough.
Tell them they're a menace to our land.
Tell them in a way they'll understand.

CHORUS

Get up and get out
If you have any doubt
About this U. S. A.
If you don't like it here,
Why, the ocean is clear;
There's a boat sailing home every day.
There is only one flag,
Not a dirty red flag.
The flag that will never fall.
Lay your life down for that.
If you won't, here's your hat;
Just get up and get; that's all.

Senator Lusk does not seem to be satisfied with the oath of allegiance ceremony through which New York City teachers are obliged to pass, and Superintendent Ettinger promises to plan out a more thorough procedure for looking into their politics and morals.

The state is putting the infamous speech of Mr. Littleton into the hands of thousands of the New York school children. They have no chance at all of seeing "The Albany Affair" in the light of its true meanings and bearing on the future.

The National Security League is moving serenely on—making everything "secure" between the earth and the sky; secure for the reactionary bureaucrats.

I have heard some grim stories, indeed, of how individual children have suffered.

New York.

L. O.

From an Irish Quaker

IRELAND is in a worse quandary than ever. England has only one idea—force, oppression—then a stupid speech by Lloyd George—then more violence and oppression. I hope you don't believe half the stories sent out by British correspondents here. The worst of government oppression and stupidity is that their violence results in individual acts of violence in return by stupid and irresponsible youths here such as the attempt to kill Lord French and the shooting of policemen.

If the government had not made it impossible for Sinn Fein leaders to meet and issue their advice to the Irish people, I think they would have been able to have kept the people in control.

Lloyd George's scheme is preposterous. As you know, I am a moderate and would work for a compromise inside the empire (although I do not believe in empires); but Lloyd George's scheme is out of the question and is worse than the Home Rule Act.

He actually proposes to keep control of all Irish finances, including income tax, customs and excise by England. What could an Irish Parliament do for Ireland if England has our purse? Lloyd George proposes to tax us 41 millions of pounds a year, which

is far too high for a country of 4 millions of people, mostly poor. Of this the Irish Parliaments are to be returned (if they are good, obedient slaves of the British Parliament) 23 million pounds, leaving a tribute to England of only 18 millions a year to help to pay for a war Ireland never believed in and to help to set up a League of Nations which excludes the Irish nation. Is there no end to British arrogance? Of course, all the kindly English liberals (sic) feel virtuous that Ireland has been offered a Parliament which she refuses; and once again their consciences are lulled to sleep in the knowledge of British virtue and love of freedom!

I enclose a cutting showing the kind of thing P. W. Wilson writes. What do you think of it? I suppose he calls himself a liberal, and yet he thinks America would hack England if she set up a Parliament and then started to coerce Ireland more than at present (how that could be I don't know). Is there any end to British humbug? I would like to see P. W. Wilson's article published in the United States. It shows the real value of the Parliament even British liberals would set up.

J. F. D.

Dublin.

The clipping which our correspondent encloses reads as follows:

"Mr. P. W. Wilson, the Special Correspondent of the *Daily News* in New York, wires: After watching America's reception of the latest Irish proposals, I am convinced that already feeling here has been somewhat relieved. Extremists like Hearst and the ultra-clericals are, of course, irreconcilable; but Americans generally desire that the proposals shall be pushed through whether accepted by Ireland or not.

"If Parliaments are established any further coercion will be more easily defended here. It is coercion without Home Rule that Americans dislike."

Shall the Men Perish?

LET me thank you most warmly for your fund for the children of Austria and Germany. But why does nobody ever speak of the *men* in Austria and Germany? They are starving and perishing, too. Surely you are courageous enough and Christian enough not to draw the line at 15 years of age. When we are told that in Vienna the word has gone forth that all the people above 60 should commit suicide in order that the younger ones might have a chance to live; when we read how some of the most celebrated men—among them the venerable New Testament scholar, Bernhard Weiss—have fallen victims to the effects of the blockade, our hearts cry out in anguish. Are only the children, and perhaps also the women, to be helped, but not the men? That is intolerable. Do speak out! Say a word that will move the hearts of your constituency.

J. N. B.

New York.

One of the decent features of the Paris treaty was the provision for a plebiscite in Schleswig. This plebiscite seems to have been fairly carried out and resulted, as was to be expected, in an overwhelming vote to return to Denmark. Thus was corrected one of the sins of imperial Germany. American and English papers considered it a matter of course that the German minority defeated in the Schleswig election should reconcile itself to Danish governments. Yet strangely enough those same papers are peculiarly solicitous as to the Ulster minority, proportionately not very much larger, which is opposed to Irish self-government.

The Making of "Americanism" Propaganda

By HAROLD L. ROTZEL

THE public has recently been flooded with new stories about the need of combating unrest and "red" propaganda by counter-propaganda on Americanism. Many organizations have announced the formation of committees to produce this propaganda and put it across. So far we have seen no new facts or arguments produced. The papers are full of propaganda but it is not prepared by "Americanization" committees. It is still coming from the old corrupt sources, as publicity prepared for definite "interests."

There is of course a certain background of fact against which this so-called "Americanism" propaganda is presented. Almost every one today is willing to admit that the world war has disordered our economic life and that this is the fundamental cause of our industrial unrest. But no man is willing to admit that he is taking advantage of the disorder to improve his own condition at the expense of his fellows. Moreover there is a certain inevitable vagueness in the minds of most people when it comes to economic facts and figures, due in part to popular suspicion of past political propaganda and in part to the difficulty of compiling adequate data. Even a statistician of the standing of Royal Meeker of the United States Department of Labor Statistics says:

"I am curious to find out what under the sun this American standard of life is. I am willing to admit that the American standard of living is higher than in any other country of which we have statistics. But I have not the nerve to boast about the American standard of living. The expenditure for the care of health, in the family budgets that I have examined, is wholly inadequate."

It is this disorder and vagueness which is being exploited by the "interests" in their publicity campaigns on Americanism.

During the past year I have made it my business to investigate the statistics published which throw light upon the question of wages and the cost of living as they affect the textile workers of the country. It is generally understood, I think, that the workers in this industry are the lowest paid of any of the large industries. The latest statistics for northern textile workers, for example, taken from the report of the New York State Industrial Commission, show that the average weekly earnings of these workers in June, 1919, was \$17.89. Government statistics of all kinds both state and national, agree quite uniformly upon this fact. The facts

about the increased cost of living have, of course, special significance for the lowest paid workers.

On account of these facts, the need of textile manufacturers and their apologists to explain their attitude toward wages and industrial unrest constitute what is perhaps the most difficult task of the modern commercial propagandist.

HOW INDUSTRIAL PROPAGANDA IS MADE

The National Industrial Conference Board of Boston is an organization created by a group of manufacturing associations to perform this service for them and includes in its membership both the National Cotton and Woolen Manufacturers' Associations. It has developed a remarkable publicity department, which keeps in close touch with politicians, editors and public speakers, but which is very careful not to let the public know the character of the services which it renders.

My attention was attracted to this so-called National Industrial Conference Board by a flaring article in the Boston *Sunday Herald* about the increase in the cost of living as compared with the increase in wages. It announced that the increases in wages in seven major industries had been more than the increase in the cost of living. As this conflicted with the statistics of the U. S. Bureau of Statistics, I at once wrote to the editor of the *Herald* for information about this organization. I was informed "that the party whom you should get in touch with is Mr. George N. Peek, Moline, Ill., Chairman of the board." A letter to Mr. Peek brought back a reply from the president's office of the Moline Plow Company saying, "I cannot give you the report of the Industrial Board, the records of that Board having been turned over to the Department of Commerce, to which you are referred." A letter to the United States Department of Commerce secured the following information: "The National Industrial Conference Board is not an activity of this department, but is a cooperative body composed of representatives of national and state industrial associations, and closely allied engineering societies of a national character. A communication to Mr. Magnus W. Alexander, managing director, 15 Beacon Street, Boston, will no doubt procure the desired information." Upon request, Mr. Alexander sent me a bulletin of the Board which frankly states that "it has responded to the call and acted as the representative of American industry in cooperation with the government in an endeavor to find solutions

of certain industrial and economic problems precipitated by the war." It is clear, then, that this association of manufacturers and the Department of Commerce have been and are closely associated as cooperative bodies supposed to be working for the same ends.

I at once secured a copy of the statistics published by this National Board on "Wartime Changes in Wages." These statistics, although manifestly presenting facts in the best possible light for the manufacturers, are still true enough to prove that the textile workers are the lowest paid and that war increases have not improved their conditions in terms of actual purchasing power of their wages. No evidence is so good as that volunteered by the opposition in any dispute. What better evidence of an underpaid industry could be had than the statement of this Board that "in 1914 the average weekly absolute earnings for men and women in the cotton industry were \$10 and \$7.70, respectively, while in 1918 they were \$20.60 and \$15.37," and that in March, 1919, "the average of weekly earnings of both male and female workers were 17 per cent lower than those of September, 1918" (page 24).

But, although these figures are more favorable to the manufacturers than those of the Federal Government, which have been secured "with greater thoroughness and accuracy" (see October *Monthly Labor Review*, page 5), the publicity department of this so-called National Board has not used them. Naturally enough. Their experts, however, discovered that, according to their figures, in September, 1918, when war wages and overtime production were at their highest, the increase in the actual weekly earnings of the operatives were slightly greater than their figures on the increase in the cost of living. It was this fact that was seized upon and attractively written up and illustrated with pictures of the shrinking dollar. There were full explanations about the consequent pinching of the salaried class and how it had benefited the manual workers who were now buying automobiles and Victrolas. It ended with a regulation 100 per cent "work more-save more" Sunday school moral. Quite naturally the 17 per cent reduction has received no publicity.

"EDUCATING" THE PUBLIC

But these propaganda statisticians are not idle when the facts refuse to show up to suit their purposes. After all, facts never have had much to do with this kind of propaganda.

ASTOUNDING proof of this came to me in regard to this so-called National Board when, through a providential accident, I secured the evidence which reveals the tactics by which this Board gets its propa-

ganda messages across to the public. The evidence is in the form of what purports to be an extended interview with Governor Calvin Coolidge, entitled, "Have Faith in the United States—A Notable Interview with Gov. Calvin Coolidge, the Victorious Law and Order Executive of Massachusetts." It features many statements in the interests of the manufacturers such as the following: "We have curbed the cupidity of Capital; we cannot yield to the cupidity of Labor"; "Full stomachs and full hearts will be found to have their own answers for wild-eyed inciters to terrorism," etc. The interview, sent out in printed form, describes in detail Governor Coolidge's appearance, force of character, and strength of purpose, and how he smiled and answered questions as he "looked thoughtfully down on historic Boston Common."

OFFICIALS AS CATSPAWS

The letter which was sent out to the Board members with the interview tells the whole sordid story of the way in which public men with political ambitions are either blackmailed into propaganda statements for the manufacturing interest or prostitute themselves in the interest of a class against the interests of the public which they are supposed to represent. The letter runs as follows:

Frederick P. Fish, Chairman. Frederick C. Hood, Treasurer.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD

15 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
724 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

MAGNUS W. ALEXANDER,
Managing Director.

BOSTON, MASS., Nov. 28, 1919.

To Board Members:

You will be interested in reading the enclosed interview with Governor Coolidge, which will appear in many papers throughout the United States on Sunday, Nov. 30th. This interview was prepared in our office and then submitted to Governor Coolidge, who readily agreed to stand for it, with a few small changes which he suggested and which we made.

The National Industrial Conference Board does not appear in the case, but the Editors of the newspapers know that the information was prepared here and came from us. What we are interested in, of course, is to put proper information across to the public rather than to have the National Industrial Conference Board advertised.

Quite a number of editorials on the industrial situation which have appeared from time to time in the public press have been similarly influenced and often initiated in our office.

Very truly yours,

M. W. ALEXANDER,
Managing Director.

The interview appeared as announced in the *Sunday Globe* in Boston and doubtless in many other "papers throughout the United States." Gov-

ernor Coolidge got publicity for his Presidential ambitions. The manufacturers got "proper information across to the public." The National Industrial Conference Board satisfied its creators without losing its effectiveness as a supposed scientific body co-operating with the government departments in the solution of our industrial problems.

Why object? Isn't this a free country where

every one can do as they please and where conflicting interests are sure to bring out the facts and the methods used to influence public opinion? Yes, if I can get the same publicity for this article that was secured for the framed-up Coolidge interview. Does any one believe that it can be done? If it cannot, to what extent has our democracy been displaced by autocracy.

The Disintegration of Capitalistic Imperialism

ATTORNEY GENERAL NEWTON of New York State assured the House Judiciary Committee the other day that there were between 300,000 and 500,000 persons in New York City connected with organizations which sought the destruction of the government of the United States by force and violence. (The modern substitute for alcoholic stimulants is seeing red. Its effect upon public officials is such as to call for a new kind of prohibition law.) A few days after Attorney General Newton's alarmist statement, Harold Lord Varney, until recently one of the more prominent young leaders in the I. W. W., informed his fellow-citizens through the medium of the *New York World* that even the I. W. W., for all its revolutionary talk, was not a red organization but only a pale pink; that the American workman was not ready for revolution, and that for his part he was constrained to renounce Karl Marx and all his works and go back to the capitalist system.

We are inclined to believe that Mr. Varney more accurately diagnoses the state of mind of the American workman than Attorney General Newton. Nevertheless, both are subject to precisely the same delusion. They think that revolutions are made by great bodies of avowed and determined revolutionaries pledged to adopt a new program of radical social change. Such is not the case. Perhaps the greatest historian of the French revolution has told us that in the beginning the men who made the revolution had no intention even of establishing a republic. The logic of events and the stupidity of the French court swept the people on into the full tide of revolution. We do not mean to suggest too close an analogy between the French situation in 1789 and the American situation today, but we do mean to point out that it is quite possible for any social system to become so weak, so lacking in vitality and constructive force, that it falls before enemies whose strength had but a little while ago seemed almost negligible. To this fact the surviving members of the House of Romanoff might, if they chose, bear eloquent testimony.

Men half unconsciously make certain requirements of the social and economic system under which they live. It must give them, if not perfectly at least in increasing measure, security, bread (and the modern man is increasingly demanding cake as well as bread), freedom, fellowship, enlightenment. These needs are not always felt with anything like equal force. If men are fairly prosperous they will for a long time put up with serious limitations on

their freedom and a very spurious brand of culture and enlightenment. Nevertheless though the fire of freedom may sometimes burn low it cannot be extinguished in human hearts, and at unexpected times it flames into great conflagrations. Now the reason why thoughtful men are proclaiming that revolutionary change in the economic and social order is inevitable—is indeed upon the world—is precisely because the capitalistic imperialistic system is not satisfying these primary demands of men. That fact is more immediately apparent in Europe than in America, but the disintegration of capitalism which is so obvious in European countries is bound sooner or later to involve the United States. The very hysteria of our governing classes, the uncertainties and futilities which control the policies of the Allied nations in their dealings with Russia, with Germany, with one another and with their own citizens, are signs of the decay of the system which grew to such strength and power in the years before the Great War.

Every day's news emphasizes the failure of the capitalistic imperialism. Every day's news emphasizes not so much the growth of conscious revolution but of a great unrest not in one class but in all classes of men. Humanity is crying out: Who will show us any good thing? It is from this standpoint that THE WORLD TOMORROW insistently urges men and women to realize that change is inevitable and to seek while yet there is time for principles and a program by which changes may not be blindly wrought, but worked out with conscious purpose, inspired not by hate but by good will. It is one thing to see clearly the inexorable doom of the old order; it is another thing to be sure that a new and nobler order will be established. The breakdown of the present system is leaving labor the strongest potential force in the world. But if labor is not conscious of its own solidarity, if it is infected with the national and racial hates of our time, if its main concern is for comfort rather than freedom, and for diversion rather than enlightenment, it may be that humanity will wander long in the wilderness before at last it comes to its promised land. It is as true now as in days of old that without vision the people perish; and the great task of our time is to seek the vision which will lift men's eyes up above the welter of personal interest and prejudice and give them steadfast purpose for the attainment of a new and glorious social order based upon the co-operation of free men.

Gentle Revolution in Great Britain

By ARTHUR GLEASON

B RITISH workers have the instinct of property. And a hundred years of experience with "private enterprise" has led them to believe that under it there is no reasonable chance of property owning for the majority of workers.

They desire a reasonable reward for hard work, initiative and thrift. And "private enterprise," they are convinced, fails to give that reward to the mass of producers, because it earmarks too much of the reward for the small group of financing and marketing agents, and for absentee capital.

They claim that the man willing to work should be permitted to work. And they know that the organization of industry under "private enterprise" has carried with it a "fringe of unemployment," that from two to ten per cent of willing workers are periodically out of work.

They wish high production. And they have seen "private enterprise" defeat their energy by under-cutting in piece rates the increment of productivity which they make. They have seen "private enterprise" restrict output—not according to the need of the consumer, nor according to the laws of production for use—but in relation to the prices of the market—prices based on a system of private profits.

They believe that prosperous (that is, well-paid) producers are the best consumers, and are themselves the best market. They believe that under-consumption is the disease of "private enterprise."

In short, the workers will no longer work for unrestricted "private enterprise," with its profits for a small group, its competing interests (and consequent lack of unified efficient management), its failure to install modern machinery and to use scientific research, its underpay, overwork, bad housing, preventable accidents, proletarian disease, and its negation of constitutional government in industry.

As the *Times* says:

"We are, in truth, in the throes of a national crisis not less fateful and in some respects more dangerous than the war from which we have just emerged unscathed as a nation. This crisis has not been created by the war. We were drawing towards it before the war."

And again:

"The truth is that we are passing already through a social revolution. Psychologically, indeed, it has been accomplished, not completely, but sufficiently to warrant the word 'revolution.' Most people perceive that a social turnover, which has changed the status of classes and their relation, has occurred, but they are puzzled and confused about it. Some regard it as

temporary and expect to see it pass; they underrate its significance. Others misread it in another way. They see in it an opportunity for realizing some theoretical form of society which happens to appeal to them. They would narrow it to some particular end of their own. Others, again, are simply bent on getting as much as they can out of it. The labor questions are part of these confused and half-conscious aspirations, which imply a tremendous clash of interests. The process of settling them means the translation of the revolution already subjectively half accomplished into defined and concrete forms which will possess stability and permanence. It is a gigantic business, needing clear vision and calm thinking, for it is all new."

What is the nature of the revolution?

Mr. James H. Thomas, head of the Railwaymen, has answered:

"The demands of the workers can be summarized under four heads—first, shorter hours; second, higher wages; third, share in control; and fourth, the nation to own those things that are essential to the life of the nation, such as transport and mines."

The first two demands are to abolish poverty and its effects. The last two are to establish freedom.

On hours, the sub-committee of the Industrial Conference obtained the unanimous vote of the employers, on a universal 48-hour week. The miners have obtained a 7-hour day (in two years, with certain provisos, a 6-hour day). Lord Leverhulme is preaching a 6-hour day, and installing it in his plant. A 47-hour week has come into force throughout the engineering and ship-building trades. A 48-hour week is not an 8-hour day. An 8-hour day is a 44-hour week (Saturday half holiday). This will be the second step of which the Industrial Conference demanded is the first. Lord Leverhulme's 6-hour day may be the third step in the national program.*

On wages, the sub-committee of the industrial Conference, with a unanimous vote of the employers, has declared for a basic minimum wage. The workers demand that war-wages be made permanent.

As regards joint control, the Government is committed to the principle by the Whitley Reports. The workers have no desire (after the war experience) for bureaucratic control of capitalist enterprise. They wish public ownership, direct administration, local government, and joint control. It is worth while to define exactly what is meant by

* "Hours" need to be studied. What is the most efficient working day—not for a month or a year—but for the working life, is not known. The differential in various industries is not known.

joint control. Mr. G. D. H. Cole was chosen secretary of the Trade Union Representatives of the Industrial Conference. In the Report which he and Arthur Henderson signed, it is stated that "the Whitley Scheme, in so far as it has been adopted, has done little or nothing to satisfy" the demand for "a real share in industrial control."

Elsewhere, he has stated:

WHAT THE WORKERS MEAN BY "SHARING CONTROL"

"It is a great mistake to think that the miners or the railwaymen want merely the adoption of the Whitley Report. The railwaymen—including both the National Union of Railwaymen and the Railway Clerks' Association—have rejected the Whitley Report, and the miners have shown not the smallest desire for its adoption in their own case. The sort of control which these bodies have in mind is something different, and something which, to the ordinary business man, will seem far more 'revolutionary.' For, whereas the Whitley Report merely secures the full recognition of the right of collective bargaining, without in any way changing the status of the parties to the bargain, the miners and the railwaymen are seeking a real share in control.

"What, then, do the miners mean exactly by this share in control? They mean at least two things, and to each of these things they attach the greatest possible importance. In the first place, they want equal representation on the national Commission or Committee which exercises central and general control over the mining industry and, in the second place, they want equal representation upon committees exercising control over particular pits.

"It would be wrong to regard these demands merely as the result of 'extremist' agitation. Indeed, the 'extremists' are seeking not joint control, but complete and exclusive control of the whole mining industry as a part of a general and comprehensive social revolution."

This demand must be sharply distinguished from that of exclusive control by the workers: a demand made by a small percentage only of the workers. Mr. Smillie has made this distinction clear. To Mr. Lloyd George on February 21, he said:

"There is no miner in this Miners' Executive of ours who has any desire to do anything for the purpose of wantonly interfering with the industries of this country. But, although the newspapers pay particular attention to some of us, pointing out that I, for one, am a Syndicalist, who wishes to take the mines over for the miners and work them for the interests of the miners and not of the State, that is absolutely untrue; neither is there any member of the executive committee of this Federation, as far as I know, who has any such idea. Our desire is to have the mines nationalized, taken over and worked in the interests of the State, in order that there may be—and we know there can be—not merely an enormous addition to the output, but a considerable reduction in the cost if the State were working the mines."

Mr. Vernon Hartshorn is miners' agent in South Wales, member of the executive of the Miners' Federation, and member of Parliament. On this point of nationalization and joint control he said:

"At the present time, the miners are in a frame of mind in which they are prepared to treat fairly and recognize all the interests that have grown up in industry. But if these demands are not granted, Syndicalism, or, if you like to call it, Bolshevism, will take the place of the demands the miners are putting forward at the present time."

This demand for joint control must be equally distinguished from that modified control which would begin and end with welfare devices, social outings, and working conditions in the sense of lavatory accommodation. This is the kind of "joint control" which the delegation of American business men thought they found in the north of England.

To the Coal Commission, Emil Davies, general manager of the Banking Corporation, financier, economist, and London County Councillor, testified to the need for joint control as a brake on the revolutionary movement:

"I think the psychological effect upon the miner of these big dividends and of these capital bonuses is bad for the nation and bad for the industry. I think it is quite conceivable that the miners or railway workers might ask more than the conditions of the industry justify. But so long as these men see big dividends and, every few years, a lot of bonus shares which makes the dividend look smaller than it really is, and every two or three years they see new shares being offered below the market price, and they find a lot of local people holding a few hundred shares making hundreds of pounds, they think naturally that the industry is making millions. Let these profits be pooled over the whole industry, as they would be if the industry were nationalized, and let the men have their representatives on the Board of Management so that they know there is no hankey-pankey, and it would be possible to show the miners and railway workers that there did come a point when they were asking more than the industry could stand. My point is, and I am thinking of the trade and industry of this country, that so long as the present state of things goes on you will not get the men into what you would call a reasonable frame of mind."

PRIVATE PROFITS SYSTEM CONDEMNED

Towards nationalization the first steps have been taken. The competitive private profits system has been three times in the year officially condemned by distinguished captains of industry, appointed by the Government. The Coal Commissioner's report—as accepted by the Government—was signed by Mr. Justice Sankey, Mr. Arthur Balfour (managing director of steel works at Sheffield, and former Master Cutler), Sir Arthur Duckham (engineer, Director of Aircraft Production, and of the Ministry of Munitions), Sir Thomas Royden (Shipowner, railway and bank director).

Their report states:

"The present system of ownership and working in the coal industry stands condemned, and some other system must be substituted for it, either nationalization or a method of unification by national purchase and or by joint control."

Sir Richard Redmayne, the Government's principal coal official, states:

"That the present system of individual ownership of collieries is extravagant and wasteful, whether viewed from the point of view of the coal mining industry as a whole or from the national point of view, is, I think, generally accepted."

Speaking for the Government on the system of transportation and the supply of power (railways, waterways, canals, roads), Sir Eric Geddes, Minister of Ways and Communications, has stated to the House of Commons:

"In the past, private interest made for development, but today, I think I may say, it makes for colossal waste."

"We must forego the luxuries of competition, we must forego private interest and local interest in the interest of the State."

The day of private enterprise and private profits in public utilities is ended, because the workers demand a higher motive for production than the creation of wealth for a few. It is misleading to write of Whitley Councils and the Industrial Councils, as if they were love-feasts where capitalist employers and workers have seated themselves in amity, with a common aim and a new spirit.

The new spirit in labor is to abolish poverty and to win freedom. Mr. R. W. Cooper, the coal owner, asked Mr. Straker, of the Miners' Executive, the most searching question since Pilate's. He asked the miner: "What is freedom?"

And Mr. Straker answered:

"So long as men are what they are, they desire to know and understand that which affects their own life so closely."

Cooper: "You will agree that if a man feels he is getting his fair share of the produce of his labour he will be satisfied from the domestic or comfort side of the question."

Straker: "I suppose that would satisfy him. If he were getting his fair share he ought not to have any more."

Cooper: "Is there any other aspect of the matter upon which he would desire to be satisfied?"

Straker: "The desire that every true man has to be free."

Cooper: "In what sense do the men desire to be more free than now?"

Straker: "There is a freedom of the mind, ever seeking to understand. Otherwise a man would be no better than a brute."

Cooper: "There I agree with you that his mind should be free. But in what way do you suggest that a miner's mind is not free?"

Straker: "The opportunity for knowledge of the industry they are engaged in."

Cooper: "What knowledge do they desire to have of the industry?"

Straker: "The commercial side of it."

Cooper: "I have dealt with that."

Straker: "You have only dealt with the cost."

Cooper: "And the profits?"

Straker: "How those profits are made."

Cooper: "What else is there?"

Straker: "The men object to these profits being collected by any few individuals."

Cooper: "What difference does it make to him whether the profits are made by the few or the many or the collective body called the State?"

Straker: "Because he realizes now that he is a citizen of the State."

Cooper: "Do you really think either you or I feel our citizenship any greater because the Post Office of this country is run by the Government and not by somebody else?"

Straker: "Most decidedly."

Cooper: "You surprise me."

The Church and the Cause of Freedom

IN the reaction against intolerance and oppression many prominent churchmen have taken a lead. No better statement of a truly liberal position has been issued than that signed by twenty-two leading clergymen of Protestant denominations. Leaders in no other profession have spoken so clearly as these churchmen. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends once more proved itself the worthy heir of a great tradition by issuing a reasoned Christian condemnation of sedition legislation. A declaration in favor of amnesty for conscientious objectors signed by a score of Episcopal bishops is another evidence of a spirit of tolerance in the churches.

But there are some unfortunate offsets to this Christian liberalism. Bishop Burch has done his own communion and the church at large ill service in establishing a sort of censorship over the forum of the Church of the Ascension. A wise Bishop would have welcomed Dr. Grant's hold upon the respect of radicals as an invaluable asset. In general the trouble with the Protestant Churches is that they pass admirable general resolutions which they repudiate openly or by silence in specific instances. We have commented on the failure of the Interchurch World Movement to publish the result of its investigations of the steel strike. Even more reprehensible was the failure of the Federal Council of Churches to apply to this clear-cut issue its repeated declaration in favor of the right of collective bargaining.

For actual worth the finest recent contribution of the church to the cause of labor and of freedom was made by the Catholic priests in the Pittsburgh district who identified themselves with their people against the whole might of the Steel Trust. We quote a paragraph from a recent article in *The Survey* on Father Kazinci:

Again warning reached him and this time by no grape-vine route, but direct from a high public official. If he did not stop holding strikers' meetings under the guise of religious services, his church would be closed. And this time too, Father Kazinci answered by no grape-vine route, but directly, saying that he rendered unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's. They could close his church as they had closed every hall in Braddock. They respected no sanctions of civil life. Why should he expect them to respect the sanctities of religion? They could close his church, but every morning he would be there in his cassock at the doors that overlooked the main street of Braddock and overlooked the mill, and he would paint with fresh paint each morning the words: "This church of Christ was closed by the United States Steel Corporation."

Only in this spirit and by this identification with the oppressed will Christianity ever win the workers.

Notre Frère le Poilu

By MARY KELSEY

IT was in the fitful sunlight of a day in early March, 1918, that the *blesbés* (wounded) of France were first brought to my notice. They were crawling along beside the Seine in little groups of from two to ten men, armless, legless, on crutches, pale and lifeless, stamped with suffering, poverty-stricken, an endless procession of blighted youth. They were probably the convalescents from a near-by hospital. Those first spring days saw the same grim spectacle in a thousand towns of France.

After a period of terrible suffering there comes apparently a time when the heart ceases to feel and the eyes to see. Sight and situations which at first must produce profound emotion, cease to move after endless repetition. One day at Troyes, an old town close behind the fighting-line, and the thoroughfare through which passed endless troops and munition trains I was sitting in the crowded *place*. It was at the height of one of the great offensives, and the fate of France was hanging in the balance. It was a bright spring day, and the tables of the little street *cafés* were crowded with officers and civilians and well-dressed women, drinking and watching the passers-by. All the town seemed to have turned out to enjoy the un-wonted warmth and sunshine.

Presently, down the street lumbered a train of ambulances. Each one was filled to capacity with wounded men. The line seemed endless. On the stretchers within lay pale and suffering men, staring with dull eyes on the crowds through which they were passing. I looked about me for the expressions of sympathy which it was natural to expect would be forthcoming. Not one single person raised his eyes to watch the progress of the ambulances, and so far as I could see, no one was in any way conscious of the tragedy going on under their eyes. France was tired of the sight of suffering.

It was understandable, this emotional weariness, but its reaction in individual cases was terrible.

One day in the provincial town where our work among the refugees took us, the *Sous-Préfet* referred to us a refugee who was also a *réformé*. The man was called Marché. He had been mobilized at the beginning of the war, and after some months of service had been discharged from the army without pension, for tuberculosis. He was from one of the northern departments, and in the early days of the war his family, consisting of his wife and a frail little daughter, had been driven

from their home, and had found refuge in the small town where we met him. When, broken in health, Marché returned to his wife, she refused to admit him to her one small room. He was diseased, as she said quite truly. In such tiny quarters as those which she occupied, the danger of infection would be great. Her husband must find shelter elsewhere.

The next unhappy months of Marché's life were spent in the local hospital. He could never speak of that time without bitterness. "If I had had no money of my own I should have starved to death," he once said. I asked one of the ladies of the town as to the actual conditions in the hospital. "There is no endowment," she explained; "the funds are very low, and it is necessary to center care and nourishment on the curable cases." Meanwhile that section of the country was becoming notorious for its war-wealth, and there was no time when private limousines were uncommon.

MARCHÉ SEEKS THE FRIENDS

After his discharge from the hospital Marché went to live in the garret of one of the steep old houses in the town's main street. It was in a pouring rain one autumn day that he first sought us out, his *capuchon* drawn over his head and the rain trickling from his mustache. He was living on his refugee's grant of a franc and a half a day. Rice at that time was two francs and a half a pound. Sugar was practically unobtainable; even the allowance permitted only one pound a month to the individual. Bread was the only cheap food, but the supply was so limited that the French were cut down to far less than a normal ration.

It was plain that Marché could not be living on food suitable for a man in an advanced stage of tuberculosis. The little provision of money, earned while working as a cook, was entirely exhausted, after the painful experience of the hospital. Happily we had supplies of bully-beef, condensed milk, and cod-liver oil, specially designed for the use of people in Marché's condition. Twice a week, as long as his failing strength permitted, Marché came himself for his supplies.

Presently a strange complication occurred. The old house in which Marché lived was sold, together with its furnishings, to a well-to-do refugee woman, the mother of a large family. It was important for her to get possession of his room. There was, however, a law protecting refugees, which made it

impossible for a landlord to eject tenants, even when the rent was not paid. With several foreign armies to accommodate, and tens of thousands of refugees seeking shelter as well, France was hard put to find accommodation for all those who sought it. The overcrowding was appalling, and the results of it on the morals and the physique of the French incalculably bad. There were no lodgings to be found for Marché. He was forced to stay in the little room under the roof.

It is hard to believe that anyone could have proved himself so cruel as did Marché's new landlady. After days of persecution during which he explained his position in vain, the woman took away his bed. For four days the dying man sat in a little iron garden-chair. He was sleeping when I found him in his garret, his head resting on his folded hands on the window-ledge. That night he slept in comfort on a cot, but the persecution did not cease. Next day the crazy little stove was carried off. It was plain that the situation could not continue.

It was by a happy accident that we learned that the Sisters of La Providence owned an old house in the town, and that there was an empty room in it. Marché became its happy tenant, and though death followed him there only a few weeks after his installation, there can be no doubt that those weeks were full of enjoyment for him. There was a sudden wave of sympathy for the man throughout the town. Two of the sisters from the nearby convent came every day to tend him, and the kind wife of the grocer across the street came several times a day with hot food which she herself had prepared for him. A refugee woman volunteered to keep his room in order, and M. le Curé, who till then had never approached the invalid, called frequently with bottles of red wine. Marché became the fashion. Even his wife, who through all the dark days that had gone before had entirely ignored him, tried to renew relations with him. "She shall not come in," Marché said harshly. "She turned me out when I was in need. Now that I have friends and have something to leave behind me she pretends to care." His black brows met above his angry eyes as he spoke.

One day Marché asked me a question. "Mademoiselle," he said solemnly, "for what end are we born?" I saw the man almost daily and I had learned much of his troubled soul. He knew himself to be face to face with death and his mind dwelt on great issues. I was not surprised by the answer which he himself gave, "*C'est pour chercher la liberté*—it is to seek for liberty."

Through four years of agony something great

and portentous has been born in the minds and hearts of the French soldiers. Barbusse has presented it to us in *Le Feu*. Over and over again I have met it in my talks with the men.

One day amid the desolation of the war-zone a bristly poilu stopped at the canteen which we had established for the refugees who at that time were drifting through that section of the country on visits of inspection to their more or less ruined farms. I sat at the rough table with the man while he ate his lunch, and together we discussed the past and the future, and the subject dearest to the soldier's heart, permanent peace. When he said good-bye, he left me deeply impressed by his breadth of mind and the wisdom of his conclusions.

"There must be a new internationalism," he told me. "Wars such as this that we have seen are a crime against humanity. Men must be made to realize to what the present international system inevitably leads. I spend my life in teaching, but it is hard to make men embrace new ideas. One must repeat oneself a hundred times." And as we parted, he said to me, "For you and me who see these things, the course is plain. We must talk and talk without ceasing."

I remember one noble instance of the profound humanitarianism which was sometimes developed by the terrible experiences of the war. It was in the case of a French guard in charge of a squad of German prisoners. The man had himself been at one time a prisoner in Germany, as after the armistice were all the prisoner guards of France. In this particular instance the man made himself noteworthy by the attitude of comradeship which he showed to his prisoners. I once spoke of it to him. "I know what the life is," he answered me; "I can feel for *ces malheureux*!" He had one particular friend among the Boches and the two men used to sit together by the hour discussing social and international problems. Both were eager for a *Société des Nations*, a real League of Nations in which small nations should have equal rights with the great. "And there must be universal disarmament," the German said one day when I joined in the discussion.

The kindness of the guards to the prisoners was in striking contrast to the attitude of some of the higher officials. At one post I was thrown into very close contact with the prisoners who worked for us. The condition of the men was pitiable. They were covered with boils, in rags, and they were so scantily fed that they would seize scraps of food from the ground and devour them like wolves. The man in charge of the group was harsh and brutal in the extreme and the sufferings which

the men underwent were terrible. One day there was no food whatever served out to the men owing to some hitch in transportation, and one of the poilu guards came secretly to us and asked us to feed his men. Once I saw a Frenchman go up to a German who was being transferred to another post and say kindly, "Good-bye, I hope you have not been too unhappy among us. *C'est la vie d'un esclave et encore pire*—It is the life of a slave, and worse."

THE POILU AT HIS BEST

But there are other aspects of the poilu than the heroic and the noble. His gallantry never leaves him. It was amusing in the war-zone to note the responses to a greeting in that womanless country. The dough-boy would return a wave of the hand with a cheery "Hullo" and a responsive wave. After the first start of surprise at a friendly greeting the German prisoners would put their heels together and salute in military fashion. The poilu would always and with rapture kiss his hand.

And nothing is more care-free than the poilu on leave. One day in a third class compartment I met a group of the men just returning from the triumphal entry into Strasbourg. They were bubbling over with their adventure. The whole compartment was kept in a roar of laughter as the men told of how every soldier had become a bone of contention among half a dozen women, each of whom claimed the privilege of becoming his hostess. "It wasn't the French alone who welcomed us. The Germans were *tres chic pour nous*." One of the men proudly produced the amber mouth-piece of a pipe with which his German hostess had presented him, and the photograph of a very nice-looking family was passed round the compartment for inspection. "Why should we fight such people?" I asked its owner, and the good-natured fellows echoed my words with emphasis.

Perhaps the incident which seemed to show us the poilu at his best occurred in the small kitchen of the tiny cottage which served as our headquarters. One day a big fellow in a shabby uniform came to the door. He was accompanied by a little, wrinkled, smiling old woman whom the soldier introduced as his *maman*.

"I am going back to the front," he said, "and Maman is a stranger here. We, too, are refugees. I cannot bear to go away and leave her alone among strangers. She does not lack for money, for my brother and I both send her a monthly allowance. But after I am gone she will be entirely alone and very *triste*. I come to you on her behalf. I hear that you belong to the Society of Friends."

Dogmatic Notes on Worth While Books

American Labor Year Book, 1919-1920 (edited by Alexander Trautenberg, published by the Rand School). Many events have delayed the appearance of the third volume of a series of year books. That very fact makes it more inclusive and comprehensive in its treatment of recent events. The book is divided into six parts: (1) Labor and the War, (2) the Labor Movement in the United States, (3) Labor and the Law, (4) Social and Economic Conditions, (5) International Socialist, Labor and Cooperative Movements, (6) Socialist Movements in the United States. Under these heads invaluable information may be found ranging from accounts of trials under sedition laws and the treatment of political prisoners to the quieter history of the development of the cooperative movement. No other single volume brings together material of such importance for the American student of current events. Mr. Trautenberg is to be congratulated on securing writers who treat the matters in hand authoritatively and fairly. The book is, of course, compiled not only from a labor but from a Socialist standpoint; but in tone and manner it is objective and deals with facts rather than propaganda.

The Awakening of Asia, by H. M. Hyndman. Boni & Liveright, N. Y. Here is a book which is not only filled with valuable information on a subject on which Americans and Europeans are too often ignorant, but is in itself a wholesome antidote for the poison of imperialism. After reading it one is persuaded that the "white man" has been not the burden bearer, but the burden which Asia has had to carry. The chapters on the British in India are particularly enlightening. Unfortunately some of the author's statements are dogmatic and not adequately proved—e. g., certain references to religious matters. In consequence of this fact and of the vast range of material covered in brief compass, the Awakening of Asia, despite its value, falls short of being the authoritative history of recent events in the continent which is the mother of civilization.

The Economic Consequences of the Peace, by John Maynard Keynes. Harcourt, Brace and Howe, N. Y. This is far and away the most significant analysis of present conditions in Europe that has appeared. We shall not attempt the well-nigh impossible task of reviewing a book which ought to be not merely read, but studied by the American public. History, we believe, will accept as authoritative Mr. Keynes' brilliant picture of the Peace Conference and the leading actors in it. Economists are accepting as authoritative his statistics and interpretations of economic conditions. (These were briefly set forth in our February issue under the title Looking Ruin in the Face.) There is one omission from Mr. Keynes' analysis which seems somewhat remarkable. He nowhere speaks of the effect upon economic conditions now or in the future of the enormous expansion of the British and French colonial empires. In considering indemnities, he does not deal with the value of the German colonies England and France have taken under guise of a more or less fictitious "mandate" from the League of Nations. In general, the author is rather more critical of Clemenceau's passionate nationalism than of Balfour's equally selfish but more powerful and subtle British imperialism. Moreover, it seems to us that the situation Mr. Keynes so vividly pictures requires more radical social, economic and spiritual treatment than he himself proposes. But these criticisms, if criticisms they are, in no way affect the enormous value of the service Mr. Keynes has rendered to thoughtful folk the world around.

The Last Page

THE PUBLICATION OF THE POSTHUMOUS *Untimely Papers* of Randolph Bourne, which we hope to review in the next issue of THE WORLD TOMORROW, recalls vividly to the writer's mind many treasured scenes of youth in which R. S. B. was the chief figure. To those who were more or less intimate with him at college, Bourne was a never-failing source of stimulation and encouragement; and his keen, incisive criticism helped to straighten out many a problem for his associates. How he loved to play with ideas and to dream dreams of social betterment. . . . There was an evening one spring during which the writer and R. S. B. sat at an open window through the growing dusk discussing what could be accomplished in this stumbling old world if all the youth were mobilized—not for military service but for constructive social work; if for a year or two all our young men were sent out to great camps to build roads, cultivate land, erect houses and public buildings, develop to the full the untouched natural resources of the country—an old enough dream, if you like, but elaborated with Bourne's inimitable charm and freshness of detail. . . . There were whole days during which a group of us systematically cut all classes and engaged in an endless discussion of a knotty social or religious problem, Bourne perhaps pitted against some adversary of an opposite turn of mind; and then how R. S. B. would delight in entangling his opponent in contradictions, and weaving about him a web of close argument like a spider neatly winding up a struggling fly. . . . There were balmy days, too, on the Palisades, perhaps with some charming feminine companion, when we sat for long hours on a knoll overlooking the Hudson; and Bourne's delicate conversational powers would then reach their zenith, and he would skilfully draw out of his comrades all the best that was in them. . . . Or again, he would hatch some scheme for sticking pins into the seats of the mighty, and have the authorities on his trail for some caustic and witty sally in a college paper. . . . He loved to dig deep into the thoughts and feelings of men; to analyze personal situations; to "find out how people live," as he put it. And through it all ran an indomitable but wistful courage, a hatred of injustice, a tenacious adherence to what he considered right and true—witness his stand throughout the war against all odds. . . . His early death meant not only an irreparable loss to the fighting social forces of today, but a void that cannot be filled in the affections of those who loved him.

THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME DOUBT JUST NOW whether the Allies will after all insist on their quondam demand for eight-hundred-odd members of Germany's aristocracy and bureaucracy as a blood-sacrifice. It is indeed a nice subject of speculation just what the Allies would do with these war "culprits" if they succeeded in getting them. Would the hostages be hanged or electrocuted? Hardly, with the wages of executioners steadily rising and adding to the already high cost of administering justice. Would the eight hundred be imprisoned, perhaps? This also seems doubtful since there again the cost would devolve on the already over-burdened public. Perhaps the Supreme Council had some notion of reviving the old practice of putting prisoners in the stocks: in which case they could of course be sent on tour and defray their own expenses by a charge for admission. Who would not pay a dollar, say, for an unobstructed view of a Kaiser and a whole courtful of dukes and princes?

However, we think we have the best and most economical solution of the problem that has yet been put forward. Why not utilize the talents of these men for our own good? For example, all the generals, etc., could act as instructors in our ever growing military colleges; no doubt they could give valuable suggestions in militarization and militarism even to our own Secretary and General Staff. Those not employed in this way would fill a useful niche as expert patrioteers on our public-school boards,—for it is generally admitted that in the instilling of a certain type of patriotism that grows daily more popular with some of our authorities, your true Prussian is well-nigh unsurpassed. The remainder of the eight hundred, we submit, would make invaluable nuclei for future Lusk committees.

FOR A SUCCINCT REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS AT Albany, we refer our readers to the following account in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*:

"'Mine is a long and sad tale,' said the Mouse, turning to Alice and sighing.

"'It is a long tail, certainly,' said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's tail; so that her idea of the tale was something like this:

"Fury said to
A mouse, That
 he met
 in the
 house,
 'Let us
Both go
to law:
I will
prosecute
you, —
Come, I'll
take no
denial:
We must
have a
trial;
For
really
this
morning
I've
nothing
to do.'
Said the
mouse to
the cur,
'Such a
trial,
dear sir,
With no
jury or
judge,
would be
wasting
our breath.'
I'll be
judge,
I'll be
jury,'
Said
cunning
old Fury;
'I'll try
the whole
cause,
and
condemn
you
to
death.'"

Do You Read Books?

If you do, you will be glad to know that you can now secure them from

THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT

And not only that: by using our new Book Department, you will be giving us a helping hand. We estimate that if each of our readers would buy from us only one average-priced book a year, it would net the magazine

approximately \$4,000.

And, of course, if each reader buys five books a year, our gain would be about \$20,000. Here, then, is an additional and very simple way in which you can help us.

We will supply books of any American publisher. Merely write us what you want; enclose the price of the book plus 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west (or ask us to send it by express C. O. D.); and we will endeavor to give you prompt and efficient service.

Please Note

that buying books should not take the place among our good friends of direct financial contributions, small or large. The Book Department is merely an additional means for us to secure needed funds.

Why Not Buy Books for Easter Gifts?

LA FOLLETTE'S EDITORIALS

These are stirring times in the history of the Nation. Great problems affecting the future welfare of the average man are being solved by Congress. Senator Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin, the fearless leader of the common people, is on the ground fighting the forces of self and plunder.

GET THE FACTS

The great powers of wealth have been arrayed to crush him. He has been subjected to a tirade of abuse. Now the "kept" press is trying to stifle his influence by a campaign of silence. But his editorials in *La Follette's Magazine* blaze out as a torch lighting the way to a better day for the average man. He gives you facts to be found in no other publication. He is fighting for

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

and press. The motto of his magazine is, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

La Follette's is a monthly. The subscription price is \$1.00 a year. It is not throttled with advertising patronage. It is published in other publications, to a war-weary world. It fights to bring justice to the millions of people who can send no profiteer-paid lobbyists to Washington to fight for them. A single issue will be worth the price of a subscription. Better send \$1.00 by return mail for a year's subscription.

LA FOLLETTE'S MAGAZINE

MADISON

WISCONSIN

Send postcard for free copy of

THE CITY OF GOD

Being Chapter XV from

BOUCK WHITE'S

THE FREE CITY

A BOOK OF NEIGHBORHOOD

Moffat, Yard & Co., Publishers

31 Union Square

New York City

Those Who Are Ready to Embark Upon

CHRISTIAN ADVENTURE

In an Effort to Make the Kingdom of God a Present Reality for All Men by the Use of Love to the Uttermost Without Stint or Limit

WILL FIND A WELCOME IN

The Fellowship of Reconciliation

118 East 28th St.

New York City

Western Office, 19 So. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.

Information in regard to the principles, aims and methods of The Fellowship will be sent gladly on request.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 4

APRIL, 1920

10 Cents

A LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM HENRI BARBUSSE

"The whole series of tragic events which we call history is for the most part a spectacle of a vast injustice and a vast absurdity. Every phase of our modern social system is on trial. No superficial or partial solution will suffice. The new order of society can be brought into being without bloody strife only if men of thought bring to the task the calm wisdom of reason itself.

"It is always the counter-revolutionists, the reactionaries, who make bloody the efforts of the people to be free. Those who are really responsible for the war between the classes are those who oppose the workers, not those who defend them."

IS DEMOCRACY A FRAUD?

By Robert L. Wolf

ON LIVING IN TWO WORLDS AT THE SAME TIME

By Richard Roberts

ALLIED DEMOCRACY AND THE JEWS

By L. M. Glaseman

IS AMERICA TO BLAME FOR EUROPEAN IMPERIALISM?

THE COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEM IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

By Samuel Tilden Ansell

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the April Issue

	Page
A Letter to the American People from HENRI BARBUSSE.....	99
Clarté	101
Signs of the Times.....	102
Is America to Blame for European Imperialism?	105
On Living in Two Worlds at the Same Time, by RICHARD ROBERTS.....	107
Counter-Revolution in Germany.....	109
Attled Democracy and the Jews, by L. M. GLASSMAN	110
The Court-Martial System in the American Army, by SAMUEL TILDEN ANSELL	112
The Way They Live, by LOUISA SARGENT	115
A Plea for the Churches, by OWEN OF THEIR FRIENDS	116
The Stockholders Statement	117
Open for Discussion.....	118
Is Democracy a Fraud? by ROBERT L. WOLF	119
Spying on Labor.....	121
Making a University Safe for Democracy, by GENETIVIA TAGGARD	122
Prisoners and Captives—II. A Lumberjack's Experiences	123
Excursions in the World of Books	124
The Last Page.....	126

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III, April, 1920, No. 4

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
118 East 28th St., New York.
Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer;
John Nevins Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gore Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Stansfield Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Lench, John Howard Melish, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Terrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.00; Canada \$1.15; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.25. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

HENRI BARBUSSE, French author, is best known in America through his books *Under Fire* and *Light*. He served in the war as a private soldier.

RICHARD ROBERTS, well known as a writer on social and religious subjects, is minister of the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, New York.

L. M. GLASSMAN is a young journalist, formerly a contributor to the *American Jewish Chronicle*, now defunct.

SAMUEL TILDEN ANSELL, who held the rank of Brigadier General and was Acting Judge Advocate General during the war, has labored constantly during many years for the amelioration of our system of military justice and discipline.

LOUISA SARGENT is a high school teacher in Ponda, Iowa.

ROBERT WOLF is connected with the United States Tariff Commission.

GENETIVIA TAGGARD, one of the most promising among our young poets, is connected with *The Freeman*.

YOU KNOW BY THIS TIME

what *THE WORLD TOMORROW* stands for. Do you believe the magazine is worth while? Do you believe it has a message for the American people? And, if you do, will you help us to carry on?

FIRST, we need 1,000 *WORLD TOMORROW* COOPERATORS. Each Cooperator supports the magazine by a contribution of \$5.00. Cooperators have a definite interest in the magazine and will be consulted from time to time on matters of editorial and business policy. We want you to become a Cooperator.

But if you can't afford this,—and we realize that spare five-dollar bills are none too plentiful,—then we ask you to help us by one or all of the following simple and practical means:

1. Make use of our new BOOK DEPARTMENT, advertised on the back cover of this issue.
2. Send us lists of your friends or acquaintances who might be interested in subscribing to the magazine so that we may forward them sample copies.
3. Send us lists of people in your town, whether acquaintances or not, who are interested in liberal or radical movements, child welfare, civic reform, trade unionism, etc., so that we may circulate them.
4. Talk about *THE WORLD TOMORROW* as widely as you can.
5. Send us financial contributions of whatever size.

We are keeping the price of this magazine at \$1.00 a year because we believe that by so doing we can reach a wider circle of readers. But until we get a much larger circulation, this means that we are running at a heavy loss. Therefore we need whole-hearted and practical support from our friends. And among our friends we count you and each one of our readers.

COMBINATION OFFERS

THE WORLD TOMORROW (one dollar a year) with

The Nation (weekly).....	\$5.25 saving 6.75
The Survey (weekly).....	4.25 saving .75
The Socialist Review (monthly).....	3.75 saving .75
The Irish Press (weekly).....	2.50 saving .75
Good Morning (Art Young's new illustrated weekly).....	2.50 saving .50
Young India (Monthly).....	1.75 saving .75

Canadian subscription to THE WORLD TOMORROW, \$1.15 a year; Foreign, \$1.25.

Don't forget to send us the names and addresses of any friends who are likely to be interested in THE WORLD TOMORROW.

Don't
Miss
It!

The most pungent and witty satire in years.
You will chuckle over it from the first page to the last.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET WUDRO

The Statesman Press, New York

25 cents a copy. Postpaid 27 cents.

For sale through THE WORLD TOMORROW Book Department

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 4

APRIL, 1920

10 Cents

A Letter to the American People from Henri Barbusse

IT must be evident to you, my American friends, that the world is passing through the most tragic crisis in its entire history. The peoples of all nations, especially the peoples of Europe, find themselves reduced to a situation from which it is hardly possible for them to extricate themselves so long as the present laws of society remain. Torn by immeasurable grief, we face a future which few men are bold enough to contemplate—a future in which lies the menace of all plagues and the beginning of all evils.

But how could it be otherwise? War is a destroyer. The ravages of war are beyond human reparation. "From ruin only ruin can come." In the outworn forms in which it seeks desperately to maintain itself the old order rushes toward the abyss.

The roots of the problem go deeper than into the immediate circumstances of the Treaty of Peace. Every phase of our modern social system, affecting intimately the lives of each and every one of us, is on trial. No superficial or partial solution will suffice. We must go back to first causes, to the reasons for being of all existing institutions.

Despite all appearances to the contrary these institutions have never changed since civilization began. Up till today the human race has lived according to laws which have embodied in many different forms the principle of the slavery of the crowd. Never has the simple right of every human being to life and happiness been truly respected. The ordinary man is no better off in these modern times than he was in the days of antiquity or in the Middle Ages. The multitudes, in peace time or in war, are only a herd of social nonentities. As Victor Hugo once said, "men are only the ciphers that follow a figure." Their real interests have never been considered. Rendered helpless by the forces opposed to them and by their own ignorance, dazzled or fooled by the ruling powers, the common

people in all countries have had no part, and still have no part in the shaping and settling of great historic questions, though they themselves may have provided the means of settlement. The whole series of tragic events which we call history is for the most part a spectacle of a vast injustice and a vast absurdity.

Nothing real is changed by merely changing words. Only verbally have slavery and servitude been abolished, and the privileges of birth. The life of the world is ceaselessly exploited and sacrificed by an oligarchy which seeks only its own narrow selfish interests.

It has always been so. It is this which has led us on from crisis to crisis, and from calamity to calamity to the great cataclysm of our time, which is only momentarily halted—thirty or forty millions of men madly hurling themselves against each other and trying to destroy each other against their own interests, even against their own will!

Facts are stubborn things. Let us proclaim them again and again: this is what the old laws of the past have imposed upon us; this is what our old beliefs and systems of government have produced. This is the basis on which our present social system is built, a system which is an organized and continuous assault upon all truth and goodness.

Simple and ignorant minds (not the minds of the crafty or the cynical) may perhaps deceive themselves into pretending that the military defeat of some one country will bring lasting peace to the world, that some good thing has come out of the war. But there are many who see clearly that though old supremacies have been displaced by the luck and chance of battle, barbarism still reigns and the power of militarism is in no way diminished in the world. The shifting and accidental combinations of the ruling classes continue as before the war to fasten themselves upon humanity like mortal diseases, mocking all justice, parceling out whole

racess, separating men of the same flesh and blood, men of the same spirit, stirred by the same just hopes. And all to what end? The achievement of one knows not what disreputable bargain! More surely than ever before future generations are marked down for inescapable ruin and death.

But it seems that the atrocious futility of the war has somehow brought a little light into the darkness of the world. It has tempered certain minds; it has awakened and shamed many consciences; it has called into question certain principles which have been blindly served until now; through it all we have caught occasional glimpses of the truth. Above the battle master spirits have proclaimed great ideals which, though they have not been realized, have remained imprinted in the minds of the people and will never be entirely forgotten.

The war has asked of mankind certain compelling and inescapable questions and in some places has forced the masses, eternally passive and stupefied by their never ending sacrifices, to think. Even more than that, in some parts of the world, the very excess of the catastrophe has brought about an active revolt of the people against the old order. It is this, the seizing of power by the Russian people, which is the outstanding fact of all the war. This great achieving of liberty can never be overthrown. It is a mighty act of faith of which the true significance can never be lost.

Here in France where nothing is yet changed of the old abominable system which has made of us the broken and impoverished survivors that we are, there is, more confused but not less vast, a great unrest of souls. Old and young of all classes, their numbers growing rapidly everywhere, are beginning to see, though with minds still unsettled by their false and savage traditions, the necessity for a great change.

Lastly the international working-class movement is rising steadily all the time with the certainty of the flowing tide. Notwithstanding internal dissensions, it is gradually growing in power, and this too in spite of those learned critics who vie with each other in setting up against this whelming flood certain personal shortcomings and tactical errors which do not at all affect the sacred principles of the movement.

So there arises on the ruins of the old regime which has slaughtered mankind throughout the ages and has in the end almost destroyed itself along with everything else, a new ideal built upon the impregnable rock of moral truth, an ideal which accepts as true only that which is clearly seen to be true in the light of reason and conscience, the light

which each one carries within himself. For in every man's own heart lies the way of salvation.

This new ideal proclaims the social equality of all mankind; it demands the respect which is due to the individual, and recognizes the responsibility of each man for his part in the conduct of affairs. It proclaims the law of equal labor for every man. It denies all privileges based on tradition. It repudiates all artificial divisions set up between the peoples of different nations (divisions set up by those who are both the leaders and the profiteers of the multitudes they divide, men whom an almost supernatural prestige has permitted until now to do evil on the grand scale, crushing out the life of the people in excessive hours of labor and in secret misery, driving them at the last to early and sacrificial death by battle and blockade).

To the workers who bear the burdens of society, and to that great middle class public so vague-minded and so unsettled, this new ideal declares that the laws of the future state are not abstract and complex formulas produced by theorists and specialists. Not on wanton and tyrannical violence, but on work and on merit will be based the coming social order.

We must all rally around this word *order*. We must never allow anyone to use it falsely against us. Order means harmony. Order is the reasonable and clear arrangement of ideas and of things; it is not, as some wish to have us believe, the stifling maintenance of disorder. Order allows everything to be explained and everything to be rebuilt. It is destructive of everything that is false, like the barriers between nations. The human heart and spirit are international, like truth, and like the law of good and evil. True order strengthens and sanctifies this spirit.

How many popular evils have sprung from the abominable misuse of the word *foreign*, and from the error which makes of patriotism (which in truth is a harmonious step in the union of men) an obstacle before which everything must be stopped, changed or rejected! The absurdity and the evil of this blasphemy against humanity have been proven again and again. All progress, however slight it may be, has a world-wide significance. There is no hope of salvation for any of us outside those great laws which are common to all mankind.

These are the beliefs which are coming out into the light. Of course, they are being fought bitterly and hypocritically by all those who wish to safeguard their selfish interests and to retain the power they now hold. They are being opposed also by the short-sighted, who, possessed by fear engendered by prejudice, are terrified by the pros-

pect of any change. And it is these people, we must remember, who still control the world. They control it only because of the all-pervading ignorance, an ignorance sedulously maintained, which has up to now permitted the great mass of humanity (where actually the only real source of power lies) to be sacrificed *sans arrêt et sans borne* (without stint and without limit). Only when men realize this and understand will they be saved, and will progress become a real thing at last.

The intellectuals, as they are called,—writers, artists, scientists, teachers,—are faced with a great task, a great responsibility: the task of overcoming the ignorance of men, of opening their eyes. Workers themselves, they too are caught like other workers in the tragic destiny which is common to all.

But, apart from their duties as citizens and as human beings, their great part is to carry the light. First they must know one another as comrades

and proclaim their common faith. They must make truth radiant; make men love its simplicity, bring it to disciples. 'In doing this they will be carrying out the mission which has been theirs in all great crises in the world's history. In all stirrings and awakenings of the human spirit, though up to now always partial and incomplete, poets and philosophers and writers have been the awakeners.

The help that only the intellectuals of the world can give was never more urgently needed than today. It is always the counter-revolutionists, the reactionaries, who make bloody the efforts of the people to be free. Those who are really responsible for the war between the classes are those who oppose the workers, not those who defend them.

The new order of society can be brought into being without bloody strife only if men of thought work toward that end, and bring to their task the calm wisdom of reason itself.

Clarté

WE are indebted to M. Barbusse for the following statement of the aims and ideals of the new European organization *Clarté* (Light):

"*Clarté* is to be an international union of intellectuals designed to create an unbroken and unbreakable bond stretching around the world, ignoring the so-called frontiers, uniting in fellowship all disciples of the great ideal of truth. By correspondence, by publications, by campaigns, by meetings, *Clarté* plans to establish a permanent international organization, registering, centralizing, and strengthening the progress of ideas. Sections attached to the central committee will be set up in all the great centers of the world.

"The directing Committee now appeals to you, our friends in America. Already many distinguished men have signified their support of the movement: such men as Anatole France, Romain Rolland, Severine, Victor Cyril, Steinlen, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Israel Zangwill, Bojer, Blasco Ibanez, Max Nordau, A. Latzko. These men do not constitute a political party. Witnesses of the facts, having taken part in the war, having thought upon it, they have set down a sort of program which finds itself—for there is only one truth—very close to that of international socialism.

"Those who join this movement do so as an act of faith; the support they bring to it will of itself enlarge the action and power of the whole.

"The prime aim of *Clarté* is to win the support of those innumerable lofty spirits who believe that the full realization of justice has become a question of life or death for civilization. If the emancipation of the spirit of mankind is not to be forever

denied, the intellectual leaders of the world must be clear-seeing, strong, and active."

The English section of *Clarté* has issued a manifesto which contains the following passages:

"The ideal of *Clarté* is the World-Wide Federal Cooperative Commonwealth. . . . All the militarisms—not merely German militarism—must be overthrown, and all the artificial barriers which separate men from one another must be broken down. *Clarté* aims, on the one hand, at the suppression of political and economic frontiers; on the other hand, at the suppression of economic, social, and political inequalities, and all class distinctions. . . . In other words, *Clarté* stands for international socialism.

"A conflict of ideas has succeeded to the conflict of guns and tanks—a conflict still more profound, since it goes down to the very roots of all existing institutions. This conflict of ideas is a fight to the death between the past and the future. The question at issue is whether existing social conditions and international relations shall be maintained or whether they shall be revolutionized from one end of the world to the other. . . .

"But *Clarté* is not a mere group of 'intellectuals.' Its appeal is made above all to the young, for they have been in the past the chief victims of the errors of the old, and with them the future lies. It does not seek to supplant the Socialist and Labor Parties, the trade unions, or any organization already working for similar aims. *Clarté* is an International of Ideas, working with and for the International of Labor."

The names signed to the English manifesto are those of: D. J. Brundrite, C. P. Blacker, Virginia Crawford, Robert Dell, Harold Grenfell, Frank Hodges, Aldous Huxley, Miles Malleon, E. D. Morel, Bertrand Russell, Siegfried Sassoon, Osbert Sitwell, Josiah C. Wedgwood, Robert Williams; Douglas Goldring, Secretary, 7 St. James' Terrace, Regent's Park, London, N. W. &

Signs of the Times

Class Interests and the Railroad Bill

THE railroad bill had an easy victory in both House and Senate. Many of the Congressmen took a sort of delight in flouting the labor opposition. To be sure, labor secured the elimination of any anti-strike clause whatsoever. The adjustment board provided in the bill will have behind it only the weight of moral pressure. But as the labor chiefs themselves are aware, this does not signify much so long as the injunction may be available against a strike. One great argument for the bill was that Government operation inevitably made for bureaucracy. It is certain that no one, radical or conservative, wants to see the railroads Bureaucratized. Nevertheless, the present legislation does not free us from the dangers of bureaucracy. The Interstate Commerce Commission is given enormous supervisory powers, and in the conflicts between it and the railroad executives there is at least as much chance for both red tape and inefficiency as in straight Government control. The present standard of wages is guaranteed until September, but stockholders get an absolute guarantee of pre-war profits for six months and the further protection of a direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates which will give adequate return to capital, a return which is fixed as at least 5½ per cent. for a two-year period. Owners of the so-called short lines not taken over by Federal control are presented out of public funds with an amount sufficient to make good any deficit which they sustained during 1918 and 1919, figured by their average profits during the three years before the war.

The popular cry against labor is that it puts the interest of a class above the interests of the republic. What is Congress doing by such legislation as this?

The Last Phase at Albany

THE evidence in the case of the suspended Socialists in Albany is now before the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly and the last oral arguments have been made. The Judiciary Committee and then the Assembly itself will doubtless wrangle over the matter for two or three weeks longer. The Socialist defense met the particular charges, such as they were, brought against the Assemblymen. They produced two policemen who refuted the charges of a Brooklyn girl that Solomon had spat upon the flag. They showed the constructive record of the Socialists in the Legislature. They gave those who came to the Assembly room a long, able, and on the whole interesting course on the meaning of political freedom, the theory of Socialism, and the attitude of Socialism toward the war and toward "God, morality, and the home." They read into the record the following incendiary statement made by a non-Socialist while the American army was still in France: "Sincerely do I hope, looking up to my God tonight, that they [the soldiers] will have enough ammunition left when they come back to use on the hypocrites and bigots and enemies of democracy who have stolen democracy while they were

away." No charges were made against the man who said this—it is safe to say these things if you are not a red, but a wet. Martin McCue, 100 per cent. Tammany Assemblyman (Tammany's peculiar Americanism has never been doubted), can talk about shooting the enemies of democracy because he only meant the democracy of the corner saloon. The summing up of the State's Counsel was intellectually a discreditable performance. Mr. Conway (whose record warranted a hope of better things) attacked not only the five Assemblymen but the whole Socialist party as traitors owning allegiance to the Third International rather than to the Government. The irony of the situation is that Mr. Conway is a good Irish Sinn Féiner who cares a great deal about freedom in Dublin. He is also a good Catholic who doubtless finds his loyalty to the Pope quite consistent with his loyalty to the American Government. His argument that the affiliation of the American Socialist party with the Third International disqualified its members to take any oath of office is precisely analogous to the argument of the bitter anti-Catholic that allegiance to the Pope similarly disqualifies Roman Catholics.

Further comment must await the result of the Assembly's action. That action will not be determined so much by the arguments to which the Assemblymen listened as by that invisible Government which is so powerful at Albany. The liberals who denounced Speaker Sweet's original act need to keep a steady stream of public opinion directed on the Legislature to counteract the hidden influences of stupid prejudice and calculating self-interest.

Two Labor Trials

THE I. W. W. trial at Montesano, Washington, has resulted in an astonishing verdict. Two of the defendants were acquitted; one was declared insane. So far so good. Two of the defendants were declared guilty of third-degree murder in the original verdict. There is no such thing as third-degree murder in the state of Washington; the verdict was therefore altered, and they and five others were declared guilty of second-degree murder. Second-degree murder means unpremeditated murder, but the indictment charged the I. W. W. with conspiracy to commit murder by their alleged attack upon the Armistice Day parade. There can be no conspiracy to commit unpremeditated murder. The men were therefore either guilty as charged or not guilty. The jury's verdict seems to be a curious compromise. Perhaps the defense may feel that it has won a partial victory in that it got even this verdict in the bitterly hostile atmosphere which prevailed.

The principal Winnipeg trial involving a considerable number of defendants still drags its weary length through the courts. Mr. Dixon, who had a separate trial, was acquitted after a very able defense conducted by himself. Following his acquittal the crown decided not to prosecute the indictment against Mr. Woodsworth which (as we recorded in our last issue) charged him with the sin of quoting the prophet Isaiah.

The Wind Changes

SHREWD observers report a distinct reaction against intolerance throughout the country. It is said that even Chambers of Commerce are turning against the deportation policy and the wholesale raids upon Communists. Recent statements of presidential candidates also show which way the wind has begun to blow. When Calvin Collidge and Nicholas Murray Butler and other conservative Republicans begin to talk more piously about free speech than about the horrors of Bolshevism, it is certain that there is a new spirit abroad in the land. According to Assemblyman Amos of the New York Legislature, every presidential candidate except Major General Wood has condemned the suspension of the five Socialist Assemblymen. Some observers trace the turn in American opinion to Speaker Sweet's conspiracy against representative government in New York. We may yet have to build a monument to him as the unwitting preserver of our liberties.

Not Yet Is the Game Won

THERE is a danger of overestimating the strength of the back-to-sanity movement. Deportees are still to be found, confined under outrageous conditions on Deer Island and Ellis Island. Only the other day by accident John Domason, a Dalmatian by birth and a member of the I. W. W., was discovered at Longwharf Immigration Station, Boston. He had been held in various jails and detention camps for three years without indictment, without trial, without deportation. Apparently he was forgotten by higher officials and certainly by the outside world. He received not one letter in those three years. He could not have been more completely lost if he had been spirited away to the Bastille in the days of the Bourbon kings. According to report, when Domason's existence was called to the attention of Assistant Immigration Commissioner Sullivan, he said, "We will be glad to get rid of him." It is expected that he will soon be released. What does a Government owe to a man who has thus been held for three years?

Nor is this all the story. Trials under state criminal-anarchy laws go merrily on. Gitlow has been convicted in New York, Gabriel in New Jersey, Miss Whitney in California, and doubtless others in other states, for no offense but revolutionary opinions. Scores of other indictments are pending. Miss Whitney's case has aroused wide comment because of her noble record as a public-spirited citizen who worked for suffrage, for educational reform, and in behalf of the Negro. She won the ill will of the authorities in the first instance by going bail for the I. W. W. And her indictment followed her membership in the Communist Labor Party. While things like this are happening it behooves no liberal to rest from his labors.

Starting out the Teachers

TO those who look for the establishment of a nobler civilization no situation seems more alarming than the condition of popular education. The schools are not efficient, they lack proper equipment, they are not holding the children, they are being used for propaganda purposes by the

reactionary interests. There is no more challenging task in our day and generation than the question of educational reform. How an ideal system of education is to be founded under the present social order, we do not know, but we do know that there are certain immediate steps that can be taken. We have already published figures showing the extraordinary shortage of school teachers. Many of the best men and women are leaving the profession; others are so pressed by financial cares that they cannot do their best work. In the United States it is estimated that there are 35,000 unfilled teachers' positions and 65,000 which have been filled only by lowering the standards. In New York City, during the second week of March 115,000 children were sent home because of lack of teachers. To remedy this situation we must pay teachers a living salary, which has been denied them. In New York City, for instance, the "beginning salary" is \$935 per annum. An increase recently granted will add \$35 per annum. Teaching requires a long course of training, rigorous examination, and much native ability; yet it is paid less than well organized trades. Fortunately there has been introduced in the New York Legislature a bill which grants a 40 per cent. increase to teachers and supervisors receiving less than \$2,260 a year, 30 per cent. on salaries up to \$4,000, and 20 per cent. on salaries in excess of \$4,000. It provides that the State shall pay half. In the Senate the bill has been presented by Mr. C. C. Lockwood and in the Assembly by Mr. C. B. Donohue. We urge our readers who are citizens of New York to bring all the pressure possible on the Legislature for the passage of this bill.

Fighting Welfare Legislation for Women

THE New York Legislature is considering two bills providing a minimum wage and eight-hour day for women. These bills are strongly backed by women's organizations, among others, the Woman's Trade Union League, the Consumers' League, and the Y. W. C. A. But there is danger that they will fail in the Legislature. Already one chivalrous legislator has discovered that now that women vote they are entitled to no particular protection in industry. This is an argument that is very dear to the hearts of the canning industry. What gives more than common importance to the discussion is the fact that a Woman's Equal Opportunity League has been formed to fight against such legislation for women. Some of the arguments the League advances are decidedly specious, perhaps the most convincing being the cry, "Let women organize and get what they need for themselves. They need no statutory protection." Mrs. Florence Kelley of the National Consumers' League deals thus with that argument:

"Query—Why should an organization composed chiefly of highly paid professional or semi-professional women, some of whom have worked themselves out of the wage-earning group, devote itself to defeating the efforts of the wage-earners to gain by legislation such leisure and compensation as the more favored self-supporting women already enjoy?

"Why do they persistently ignore the fact that among the unskilled and low-paid wage-earning

women, trade unions are formed with painful slowness—that in New York, for example, our largest industrial state, only eleven per cent. of the women and girls belong to Unions?

"The permanent influences which make it difficult for women wage-earners to maintain stable unions are:

"Inexperience among the thousands of the young, and hope that their wage-earning may be only an episode;

"Family duties of the married women, especially the mothers who cannot regularly attend union meetings;

"Low wages of the unskilled multitudes which make it difficult to keep up their dues and assessments."

The Wet and Dry Controversy

AS was to be expected, a reaction against prohibition has set in. The State of Rhode Island, aided by eminent counsel, is trying to get the Eighteenth Amendment declared unconstitutional. In Vermont, towns which had been voting dry for years and years decided to go wet, now that under the federal law nothing very wet was to be had. In New York the Democrats adopted a "wringing wet" platform with great fervor, and the Anti-Saloon League is to be investigated by the same Assembly which has been taking at great expense a first course in Socialism. The Republican machine refrained from opposing this Democratic motion to investigate the Anti-Saloon League. Well-informed politicians say that in return it bargained for enough votes from the Democratic machine to expel the Socialists. The event will show. Certain it is that Assemblyman Cuvillier, the most voluble foe of the Socialists on the Judiciary Committee (not even the discovery that he had once tried to get a Socialist nomination could silence him), is now crusading against Mr. Anderson, Superintendent of the State Anti-Saloon League. He is playing up information which he received from a Presbyterian minister named Freeman, formerly employed by the Anti-Saloon League. We do not know whether the League's methods have been all that they ought to be, but it is very unfortunate that the Reverend Mr. Freeman should have chosen Mr. Cuvillier of all men as the agent of righteous exposure of Anti-Saloon League lobbying. Mr. Anderson himself has entered the fray with an attack, not on the Catholic Church as such but upon most Catholic dignitaries. Archbishop Hayes rejoined with a justification of the Church and a counter-attack on the League. Altogether there is a merry row on foot of the kind well calculated to divert popular attention from questions of good Government.

The real hope of the wets is in Governor Edwards of New Jersey, a Democrat, who has made such progress in persuading the Republican Legislature to authorize beer of the strength of 3.50 per cent. that he begins to dream of floating to the White House on a rising tide of liquor sentiment. He is positively scriptural in his advocacy of personal liberty, which in New Jersey, however, seems to be the liberty to drink but not to think. It is certain that the Governor has, to put it mildly, done nothing

against the system of industrial and official espionage so common in New Jersey.

Personal Liberty and Prohibition

THERE is need, we believe, for some straight thinking about personal liberty. A man loses the dignity of personality if he gives to the State authority over his opinions or the right to conscript him against his conscience. Society cannot progress in orderly fashion when minority opinion is penalized by popular prejudice or for the protection of special interests. Freedom of conscience, opinion, speech, the press, and assemblage are therefore fundamental. Is the right to drink of a similarly fundamental nature? Certainly society has a right to protect its members and especially the coming generation against poisoning. If it can be proved, as we think it has been proved, that the organized liquor traffic is a means of poisoning the race and a source of woe and harm to mankind, it can be prohibited as the opium traffic is prohibited in America, without interfering with any valid personal liberty. The argument does not, in other words, turn upon abstract personal liberty, but upon (1) the question of the actual effect of the drink traffic upon humanity (and in particular whether light wines and beer are seriously detrimental) and (2) the wisdom and political expediency of dealing with the liquor traffic by a constitutional amendment. For our part we emphatically believe America has a great deal to gain in terms of happiness and efficiency by staying dry; but we are aware that legislation or even a constitutional amendment cannot secure these blessings unless it is supported by popular opinion.

Weather Vanes

IN that famous Russian play, "The Beautiful Sabine Women" (a political satire), the Sabine men are delectably pictured as trained to advance to the attack "Two steps forward, and one step backward." It is on some such plan that the Allies and America approach the inevitable recognition of Russia—not without much bickering and mutual suspicion. Washington still justifies its anti-Soviet attitude by rambling and occult reasoning, but the handwriting has already appeared on the wall. Even the New York Times, the arch foe of the Soviets, has reached the point of publishing dispatches from its correspondent to prove that the Bolshevik girls are pretty, the Bolshevik police efficient, and the Russians human beings, so that it may be safe to trade with them. Mr. Eyre of the New York World has published even more enlightening dispatches telling for instance of the marvelous educational achievements of the Soviet Government. In other words, it is not only that fine Christian and avowed Socialist, George Lansbury, editor of the London Daily Herald, who cables from Moscow a vindication of the Soviets against the grosser charges so commonly preferred against them, but his example is followed by correspondents of quite another stripe. Meanwhile Lenin's silhouette lies athwart Asia. Recognition of the Soviets is a little price for Britain to pay to prevent a possible military alliance between Russians, Turks, and the races of India.

Is America to Blame for European Imperialism?

PRESIDENT WILSON, in language that has aroused great irritation in the French press, has referred to "the militarist party" and to "imperialistic designs" in France. These designs would be curbed, he thinks, if the United States Senate would ratify the treaties which he negotiated. Let us see what particular imperialistic policies France has adopted and whether they could have been avoided had our Senate ratified the treaty.

First: France has been the steadfast and bitter foe of recognizing or dealing in any way with Soviet Russia. She has favored the policy of the *cordon sanitaire* and has backed Poland in her militaristic and imperialistic attitude. *Second:* France desires to extend her colonial possessions in Asia Minor and in Syria and has already come into armed conflict both with the Turks in Cilicia and the Syrian Arabs in Syria. Her relations with Great Britain in the Near East are exceedingly strained, but she has agreed with Great Britain in maintaining the power of the Sultan in Constantinople. This stand has been taken avowedly because both powers fear the hostility of their Moslem colonial subjects if the Sultan is dispossessed, but also because both powers are jealous of each other and of any power which might get Constantinople. Moreover, France, as Bishop Darlington recently pointed out, holds from sixty to sixty-five per cent. of Turkish bonds which will become worthless unless some kind of a lien is put upon Constantinople. *Third:* France has definitely inaugurated the policy of arming Africa. She has imposed a system of universal military training on all French African colonists under which the men are called to the colors for three years, of which two are to be spent in Europe. To quote Mr. H. N. Brailsford: "The idea comes near to a revival of the slave trade, and it will drench these colonies in blood. These troops are valuable, however, for they know no pity, and they are immune from Red propaganda. They supply the means of supporting French military ascendancy in those little wars, for which both French and British conscript troops show an increasing repugnance. The system has found an appropriate arm." *Fourth:* France is pressing her demand for permanent occupation of the left bank of the Rhine on the ground that Germany has failed to live up to the obligations imposed upon her by the treaty of Versailles. This she does for the alleged reason that she must hold this German territory to secure her own safety. Doubtless many good Frenchmen, not imperialists, support the policy because of their fear of their ancient foe; but it is open to question whether the French foreign office is so much concerned with the problem of security as with the ancient imperial lust of aggrandizement, and the perpetuation of a tradition which goes back to Louis XIV.

Which of these acts of imperialism would have been changed if the United States Senate had ratified the Peace Treaty and the special alliance with

France? With regard to Russia, would not France with the support of our alliance and Article X have been bolder in pursuit of her aims? Would our membership in the League of Nations have kept her from arming her black subjects in Africa? Would France cease from her ambitions in the Near East because we had agreed to come to her defense if sooner or later some of her intrigues caused her enemies to attack her? To ask these questions is to answer them. Only with regard to the occupation of the left bank of the Rhine may it plausibly be argued that the failure of the Senate to ratify the treaty is partially to blame. We doubt the soundness even of such an argument. Had we ratified the treaty we could not have squeezed blood from the German turnip. We could not in other words have enabled her to meet her obligations under the Carthaginian peace of Versailles. France is intent upon her indemnity, and when Germany failed to pay she would have urged even as now the necessity of occupying the left bank of the Rhine, and she might have involved us to a degree that is impossible so long as we refuse to underwrite the Peace of Versailles.

We do not mean this as an attack upon the French people but as a plain statement of facts about the French foreign policy. We are inclined to sympathize with those who denounce much of the British criticism of the French as a bit hypocritical. Britain, having won all that she could wish from Germany, wants France to be generous. British diplomacy has secured Italian support in her Russian and German policy and has virtually isolated France. In the Near East the English apparently back the new Arab Kingdom against the French who claim a Syrian mandate. Free-thinking France replies by seeking the support of the Vatican as the protector for the Syrian Catholics. The preamble of a bill in the French Parliament to re-establish relations with the Vatican sets forth, according to the New York *Tribune*, that in Syria and in the Orient there are "French missionaries who ought not to be sacrificed to foreign competitors."

We believe British rule would be better than French, Greek, or Italian in Asia Minor, but it would be frankly an imperialistic rule maintained by methods as cynical and vindicated by arguments as disingenuous as any the French might devise. Earl Curzon, British Foreign minister, gave proof of this fact when he gravely informed the House of Lords that America was responsible for the delay in making a Turkish peace and the consequent misery of the old Ottoman Empire! Now a strong case (but not to our mind conclusive) can be made out to prove that America should take a mandate over all the divisions of the old Turkish Empire—at least those lying north of Syria. But it is precisely this that the Allies never offered the United States. Instead, as Jackson Fleming has shown in numerous articles in recent issues of *Asia*, the British and French have both feared American

influence. They wished us to take a mandate only over Armenia, and a somewhat restricted Armenia at that. Our protectorate would be surrounded by territories controlled by the same powers—French, English, Italian, and Greek—whose intrigues far more than our aloofness have made peace impossible in the Near East. No American mandate over Armenia will of itself protect the widely scattered Armenians. The most recent massacre of Armenians was in Marash. Marash is not in Armenia but in Cilicia, which is a French sphere of influence over which our mandate was never desired.

In the confusion of affairs in the Near East only one fact stands out clearly, and that is that there has been no idealism shown by the foreign office of any power. Nor will there be so long as economic imperialism continues. The first issue of *The Freeman* sums up the whole matter in memorable sentences:

"The only place in Europe where sentiment is never permitted is a chancellery. The unsophisticated should learn this. They may weep over the Armenian, the Syrian, the Georgian, the Greek, and the Egyptian—weep until, indeed, they wash away their own responsibility for massacre, subjugation and exploitation; but not a tear of theirs will ever leak into a Foreign Office in Europe. Why not suggest that they dry their eyes and weep no more, but devote their energy to a salutary study of the essential nature of political government whereby alone they can comprehend the anomalies and inconsistencies that now distress them? It is simply preposterous to wail about the Turkish treatment of the Armenians, for instance, as so many excellent persons are now doing, and, at the same time, to assent to the European foreign policy of economic imperialism to which alone such atrocities are due. The subject races of Asia Minor may well say 'We appreciate your tears, but we would rather have your practical help against the system of economic exploitation that you are all supporting. If you will abolish that, you will automatically reform the foreign policy of your own Governments, and then both you and we will have something less to weep over.'"

Suffering That Must Be Relieved

WHILE the Senate wrangles over the ratification of a treaty which it is already evident can never be enforced, Congress ignores the obvious duty of voting a sufficient loan to bring immediate relief to the starving people of Central Europe. After long delay the best the House did was to authorize the Grain Corporation to sell in Austria, Poland, and Armenia for cash or credit five million barrels of flour. This flour, it is explained, is of low grade and does not find a ready market in this country. It is impossible to exaggerate the tragedy which the American Congress thus refuses to face. During ten days in February the deaths in Vienna numbered one thousand and thirty-six, against eight births of living children. Heretofore Austria's plight has seemed the worst, but documents sent us by the American Relief Committee for Hungarian Sufferers give an equally heart-rending picture of

poverty and desperation. The country has been terrorized by the Rumanians. Buda Pest is so crowded with refugees that its population has been doubled. Entire families are living in one room, sometimes without any window. Railway cars and even elevators in buildings have been occupied by refugee families. Food and clothing are well-nigh unobtainable by the poor or even by the most of the former middle class. The Rumanians so stripped Hungary that there is not even glass to replace window-panes which are broken. Only as foreign aid is given can thousands of men, women, and children be saved from starvation or disease. In Hungary as in Poland, Austria, and parts of Germany it is the American Relief organization which brings the only element of hope. In Hungary alone one hundred and twenty-five thousand children are being fed. To continue and to extend this work not only should Congress grant the loan which Mr. Hoover has asked, but private gifts should be increased. It is heartening to know that in all parts of the country representative committees are being formed to co-operate with the Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Contributions up to March 1st amounted to \$2,750,000. More is imperatively needed and help in securing funds is most welcome.

Provocative Government in Ireland

SIR EDWARD CARSON has persuaded Ulster to accept the Lloyd George bill for Ireland to which we called attention in our February issue. Sir Edward must have had his tongue in his cheek when he addressed the Ulster leaders, for it is certain that the Lloyd George plan is not really desired in Ulster and will not be accepted by the rest of Ireland. Meanwhile a conservative British Labor delegation loyal to the compromise labor principle of "self-determination within the empire" has reported on its visit to Ireland that where the Dublin Castle Government "is not merely unintelligent it appears to be deliberately provocative." No wonder that provocation has led to some sad acts of terrorism.

An instance of extreme provocation is told in a recent letter from Mrs. Hannah Sheehy Skeffington, well known in America. The police broke up a meeting which she addressed, clubbed her and many of her auditors, and then fined the town £350 for rioting! Mrs. Skeffington's skull was fractured. She thinks that if she had been killed the town might not have been fined!

Some observers, alarmed by recent increases in British military equipment, fear that Dublin Castle, by sheer stupidity or by design, will bring about a massacre Easter week, when the anniversary of the Rebellion will be observed. The British Government ought to understand that an Irish Amritraz would have grave consequences on Anglo-American relations.

SIMMONS, the Negro conscientious objector, has been unconditionally released from Fort Alcatraz. Grosser, the political objector who with Simmons was confined in the infamous Alcatraz cages, finally yielded to the pleading of his friends and went to work in the prison in order to save his mind.

On Living in Two Worlds at the Same Time

By RICHARD ROBERTS

WE are today witnessing one of those reactions in thought of which the intellectual history of mankind is full. We humans are so constituted that when we discover a new truth or realize the need of recovering some forgotten emphasis, we almost always overdo it. When the great sceptical movement of the eighteenth century, Deism in England, the Encyclopaedia in France, and the *Aufklärung* in Germany had spent its force, it was followed by an age which, born in the need of faith, swung on until it had buried faith in dogma. Then came the reaction in a movement which has persisted into our own time,—agnosticism. But once more the movement overshot itself, and the break with dogma became a virtual denial of faith. And now we are in the swing of a reaction from this denial of faith and already the movement shows ominous signs of reaching lengths which will carry faith into credulity and superstition. The rise of a number of cults which call themselves in some sort mystical is indeed a certain sign of the coming of an age of faith, an age which has once more realized that the greater part of life is out of sight; but there is already a tendency in the emphasis upon the reality and the importance of the unseen hinterland of life to minimize and perhaps to deny the reality of this concrete universe of sense. One does not need to be a rationalist in order to insist that if mysticism is to be true to life it must not cease to be rational. For when it ceases to be rational, then it becomes a morbid superstition.

And so we have to insist that the business of religion is to enable us to live in two worlds at the same time, both of them equally real and the one complementary to the other. The one world is obvious and concrete enough; it is here with us all the time, and sometimes, as Wordsworth said, too much with us. The other is not so obvious; on the contrary, most of the time it feels very remote and problematical. But not all its remoteness, and not all the sceptical criticism of our feeling of its reality, have succeeded in persuading us that it is not there. And this sense of it is always breaking out in various ways. On one side of it, romanticism in literature is as much a protest against rationalism as against formalism. It is the refusal to accept the view that the frontiers of life coincide with the frontiers of this world of sense, the affirmation that the greater part of life is out of sight. And the present interest in psychical research is simply an impulse to find some sort of scientific justification for the belief in an unseen world. It is in this case mixed up with a desire to find a scientific endorsement of the craving for immortality. But these two things, while they are connected, are nevertheless different things. The desire for a contact with the unseen here and now is not the same thing as the craving for immortality; and it is with the former we now have to do. And indeed it is of much more importance to us to discover and explore this hidden world in which we may

really live here and now than to be persuaded that there is another world in which we shall live when we have passed away from this. And I imagine that we shall have no great difficulty in accepting the reality of the future world when we have discovered it for ourselves as a present fact.

THE MUFFLED CALL

The faith in an unseen world here and now round about and within us is something that will not let us go. Some thinkers have given it a sort of scientific respectability by speaking of the Fourth Dimension. But the Fourth Dimension is a term which covers our ignorance rather than our intelligence. It takes us no further along. The New England transcendentalists were in their own way insisting upon the reality of this unseen interior of life, emphasizing it almost to the point of ignoring this rough-and-tumble, fractious every-day world altogether. The unseen is forever troubling us, intriguing us, calling us. And, to quote George Romanes, "if the religious instincts of humanity point out to no reality as their object, then they are out of analogy with other instinctive endowments. Elsewhere in the animal world there is no such thing as an instinct pointing aimlessly."

There is a scene in Hall Caine's story *The Manxman* where two lads stand on the sea shore, and one says to the other, "The Sea is calling me." And his friend answers, "The Sea is calling me." And I think it is so with this hidden world. We stand upon its shores and hear its call. But we can no more interpret the call than the two lads could interpret the call of the sea, except as a call to come along, to set out upon a journey. It is a muffled call out of the darkness, and we are so little familiar with the region from which it comes that it does hardly more than vaguely disturb us. We do not know what to do with it, and most of us ignore it until we hear it no more. This is the greatest calamity that can befall a man. For it means that he has condemned himself to live henceforth on the outside of things, to live but the rind of life. He that has still the sensitiveness to hear this call however dim and vague and intermittent it be, let him cherish it as the dearest, most precious thing that he has. For it is the one slender thread that still binds him to life. And if he will but tend it and care for it, it will become a silken rope by which he will be able to climb one of these days into the wonderland of reality, and, among other things, to find himself.

THE SIXTH SENSE

Now clearly, if there is a fourth dimension, there must also be a sixth sense. If there is a real unseen world to which our instincts point, there must also be some faculty for reaching it and dwelling in it. And there is a human faculty which according to the Christian Scriptures sees the invisible. To this faculty is given the name of faith. But when we speak of faith, we have to distinguish between cer-

tain aspects of it. On one side, it is a practical attitude to life; it is the will to live on the assumption that God is love. In another aspect, it is an emotional act of trust in the benevolence of the power that orders our affairs, and consequently a submission to its will. On the one side, it provokes activity, on the other, it induces passivity. And there are times in every life when it is well for us to have a faith that can do for us either of these things as the occasion requires. Sometimes also faith is a sort of intellectual assent to propositions that cannot be verified by the senses or demonstrated by a process of logic. But faith in the sense in which we are now speaking of it is none of these things, though it is organically connected with all of them. There is another word in the New Testament that speaks of faith as the "giving substance to things hoped for." It is a dramatization of the unseen, a visualizing of the invisible. In the chapter that follows we are told of men who had visualized a city of God, and had done so so vividly that they were compelled to go out in search of it. And though they never found it, they never lost sight of it. They endured as seeing the invisible.

Yet faith is not merely a power to visualize the unseen. Not every day-dream is a vision of faith. This is no light business of weaving pleasant fancies, of building castles in Spain. It is rather seeing something that is there; and if we do not see it, of trying to see it. *Of trying to see it*, I say, for it is by no means sure that for a time we shall see anything. We are not habituated to the ether of the unseen. When the South African War was being fought we used to hear a good deal about the superior marksmanship of the Boer. The explanation was very simple; he could see farther than the town-bred Englishman because he was a child of the Veldt and was familiar with its distances and its moods. And we live and have lived so long in this stuffy world of sense that we are as blind men when we turn into the innermost; we can see nothing. It is very much like learning to swim. You go into the water and make the swimming motions—and nothing happens. You might as well be lead. But you keep at it, and one day it happens, and you can never tell how, that you swim a stroke or two. After that, it is simply a matter of practice; and the day comes when you are perfectly at home in the water and can do there what you will. So it is here. "On the mystic path," says the greatest of modern mystics, *Æ*, the Irish poet, "we create our own light, and at first we struggle blind and baffled, seeing nothing, hearing nothing, unable to think, unable to imagine." But if we persist, we come to feel at home in this medium, to be able to breathe its air freely, and to see in its strange light . . . to see that abiding reality of life which is greater than anything we can say about it, which awes us into silence but transfigures us into life.

THE MOUNT AND THE VALLEY

But it would be a mistake to suppose that this is all that matters or to suppose that this alone constitutes life. When we have become familiar with this inner world, we are apt like Peter to say when in an unexpected moment he caught a glimpse of its

wonder, "It is good for us to be here. Let us build tabernacles." But the Lord of life would not have us tabernacle in this secret place away from the fret and trouble of common life. And so Peter had to foot it down into the valley where all the old intractable problems were awaiting him. And this is the *beat*, the orbit of this life,—the path that lies between the clear mountain-tops which are visited by saints and the dark valleys of common life that are infested by devils. And as you grow familiar with this mountain path, it contracts; the mountain-top and the valley grow nearer—and nearer and nearer until at last you stand on the mountain-top and in the valley at the same time. And then you can see as Francis Thompson saw heaven and earth in a blessed commingling,—with the

"traffic of Jacob's Ladder,
Pitched between heaven and Charing Cross;"

and

"Christ walking on the water,
Not of Gennesaret but Thames."

It does not stop there. You find a world transformed. You find that you love what once you hated, that what before seemed darkness has become light. You will see men playing the old games in the market place, being burnt up by the ancient fires of greed and gold, scrambling for the prizes of the street, and you wonder what on earth they are doing it for. You find yourself indifferent to what you cared very deeply for, and caring very much for what you once cared nothing at all. Best of all, you see a new glory in the faces of the men and women, a new loveliness in the faces of the little children. And you will say to yourself, "I never saw the face of a man before, nor yet the smile of a little child. But whereas I was once blind, I now see. The name of this street is Bethel, the house of God, the gate of heaven." You will go about God's world, and see the *shekinah* gleaming on the breast of every common man, and every common face aflame with God.

BUILDING JERUSALEM

What difference to your life all this will make can hardly be spoken of here. But you will be aware of a great longing to make this concrete world with all its misery into something like the world that you have seen in the secret places of God. You will remember how William Blake had seen the heavenly Jerusalem, and how he dedicated himself to building

"Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land."

And that same passion of creation and redemption will be quickened in you also when you have seen the heavenly vision. G. K. Chesterton says somewhere that if one would save Pimlico one must love Pimlico and hate it at the same time—love it for the loveliness that it may be, hate it for the ugliness that it is. And ever beyond that crust of ugliness there is a hidden loveliness waiting to be revealed. Do you remember that Paul says that the creation

is travelling in pain, waiting for the revealing of the sons of God, waiting for its deliverance from what it is, into what the sons of God see that it may be? The redeeming of the world halts because we have not yet seen it with the eye of God. The passion for souls is dead within us because we do not see in the faces of the sons of men the image of the Son of God. But all this will be different when we have gained that inner illumination and are able to see through the rind of life to its core, through the flesh to spirit, and discover in men that imperishable image of God which, cracked and defiled though it may be, is yet the loveliest thing on earth to the man who has eyes to see. And then comes to us that great tide of compassion and longing for the gathering-in, the mending and the cleans-

ing of this broken and disordered beauty, that thrill of love that gives us no peace until we are there—after the bondsmen of God for the redeeming of man,—even though at the journey's end there may be a cross. Then,

"Only as souls, I see the folk thereunder,
Bound who should conquer, slaves who should
be kings,
Hearing their one hope with an empty wonder,
Sadly contented with a show of things."

"Then with a thrill, the intolerable craving,
Shivers through me like a trumpet call!
O to save these, to perish for their saving,
Die for their life, be offered for them all!"

Counter-Revolution in Germany

WHEN these paragraphs are written the counter-revolution in Germany has already come to its inglorious end. But what the future is to be no one can say. The counter-revolutionists had little political support and were defeated by the comparatively peaceful weapon of the general strike. Even Hindenburg saw their weakness and repudiated them. Dr. Kapp says that he yields to Ebert in order to prevent a Bolshevik revolution. Originally his colleagues said they took power in order to prevent a Bolshevik revolution! There is at least this much truth in these conflicting statements: The German reactionaries whose strength has been increased by the Allied policy of adding insult to injury are not crushed, but they will work with the Ebert or any other government which will check a genuine social revolution. It is however well-nigh inconceivable that the present stop-gap government can long continue. The coalition cabinet in which the majority Socialists have the most places has lacked vision, courage, and ideals. Noske, the strong man of the cabinet, although an alleged Socialist, has dealt with labor as ruthlessly as any Junker, to the lasting hurt of the Socialist cause he professes. The leaders of the majority Socialists sold their souls to the Kaiser in the war. They did not make the revolution but took it over from the politically inexperienced Soldiers' and Workingmen's Councils.

Now the workingmen are trying to regain power in many of the cities and have established Soviets. Whether they have the moral and physical strength at this time to establish a constructive revolutionary government remains to be seen. Much depends on the attitude of the Allies, who so far have made almost every mistake that can be made in dealing with Germany. England and France are divided in their interests, but united in wishing no Soviet government. France wants to keep Germany weak to secure for herself the left bank of the Rhine. England has already got what she wants from Germany. She has destroyed the German merchant marine and navy and taken over the German colonies. It is now to her interest to have Germany

economically stable and strong enough to serve as a make-weight to French power. This may explain some indications that the British officials would not be unfavorable to a successful *coup d'état*. They let Ludendorff, high priest of reaction, go through Finland to Russia. Why? The well informed correspondent of the New York *American* cabled that Lincoln, German press censor, once a member of the British Parliament, later imprisoned as a spy, told him that the counter-revolution was approved by the British and that its leaders had been in unofficial touch with members of the British commission. Our own stock market was very cheerful when news came of the counter-revolution; a cheerfulness which the New York *World* explains by saying that it was a reflection of the elation in British financial circles over the success of the party "favorable to the property-holding classes in Germany."

The moral of all this is that things in European diplomacy are almost never what they seem. If we cannot now prevent Allied intrigue, we can at least understand it and avoid being duped by it. It is as true today as it was when Mr. Hoover wrote the President almost a year ago, that the Allies are perfectly willing to use us "as a stalking horse economically and politically solely in the interest of political groups within the Allied governments." Nothing but harm will come of the credulity, ignorance and vindictiveness still to be found among us.

Here is Samuel Gompers (who enjoyed during the war a power and popularity since denied him) deploring in a public address the fact that the Allies stopped the war six months too soon for the safety of Europe. As if six more months of slaughter would have cured the starvation, removed the hate, softened the rivalries and intrigues between France and Britain which are now responsible for present conditions in Europe and the Near East! If Mr. Gompers speaks with the authentic voice of American labor, it is no wonder that the influence of labor for a genuine peace of reconciliation has been so slight.

Allied Democracy and the Jews

By L. M. GLASSMAN

IT has been said, and without exaggeration perhaps, that of all the nations and races affected by the great world war the Jews have suffered the most. Several millions of them living in Eastern Europe were the victims not only of the unutterable woes which were incident to the war and which befell the entire population in those territories, but also of a special brand of suffering which was inflicted upon them as Jews. Added to the scourges and horrors and diseases of the fiendish conflict there were the humiliations and tortures resulting from Jew-hatred, which was particularly rampant because of the unbridled war passions. Their position was peculiar because they had no friends, their gentile co-sufferers, as well as the enemy forces, marking them out for special vengeance; so that they seemed in everybody's way and everybody's hatred and malice were wreaked upon their heads. Thus, deceived and betrayed by friend and foe alike, starved and beaten and massacred as never before, and their cry unheard and unheeded by civilization—one might well believe that in this war this ancient people had reached the apogee of their career as world martyrs.

But there was a strange paradox in their situation: The sufferings which came to them because they were Jews were confined almost exclusively to the Allied countries. It was not in Germany, in Austria-Hungary, in Bulgaria, or in Turkey, but in Russia of the Tsar, in Poland, and in Rumania that thousands of Jews were wantonly murdered by mobs of the civilian populace and the military both before and after the enemy forces had done their work of destruction; it was there that tens of thousands of them were turned out from their homes and driven into the open fields to die of cold, hunger and disease; it was there, in Poland and Rumania particularly, that untold woes and inhuman atrocities were heaped upon scores of Jewish communities because of the treachery of the Poles and Rumanians. Yet it is a known fact that not only were the Jews in the Allied countries, Jew-baiting Russia, Poland and Rumania included, intensely loyal and enthusiastic for the cause of the Allies but that even many Jews in the lands of the Central Powers secretly hoped that the Allies would come out victorious from the gigantic struggle.

What was the explanation for this attitude on the part of the Jews? Why were they hoping for the triumph of the Allies when it was in countries associated with the Allies that they were undergoing such hellish agonies and abuses?

It was very simple. Like so many others, the

"Can the Jews hope for nothing from the rulers of the world? Will the Powers remain deaf to the agonized cry that comes from Eastern Europe? . . . For their full measure of freedom the Jews must wait until a fundamental change occurs in the economic and political life of those countries where they are oppressed. So long as there is a privileged, inefficient ruling class in Eastern Europe, the Jew will be made use of as a scapegoat to divert the attention of the discontented masses from the real source of their troubles."

L. M. GLASSMAN

Jews were ensnared by the democratic professions of the Allied statesmen, and they expected that with the downfall of Prussian militarism would finally come redemption from pogroms, boycotts, and oppressions. Since promises were being distributed rather liberally and since everybody was claiming his portion, the Jews appropriated a few for themselves. They supposed that Wilson would make good on his pledge.

One might have thought, indeed, that with all their past experiences the Jews would

have proved less permeable than others to the unctuous utterances of the Allied diplomats. But to those who know them well the Jews are a remarkably naive and confiding race when it comes to dealing with the problems of the world. Their history bears evidence, in more than one instance, of this trait in their character which has made them willing to put their trust in anyone who will bestow a friendly smile or speak a kindly word to them. The Rumanian treaty of 1878, which contained provisions for the emancipation of the Rumanian Jews,—provisions that after the Congress of Berlin were cynically disregarded by the Rumanians,—is a good example. The Jews believed easily and were easily deceived. Wilson was a trifle less credulous in dealing with the Kaiser. More recently, in 1905, when the Tsar issued his famous camouflage constitution, there were none in all that vast land who celebrated and rejoiced for the brief moment as did the Jews—they who of all people should have been the most skeptical. It would seem that their long history of suffering and betrayal at the hands of tyrants and oppressors has not undeceived them sufficiently to make them wary of the snares held out by hypocrites and enemies.

WORDS, WORDS, AND MORE WORDS

Thus they allowed themselves to be fooled again in the course of the "war for democracy," especially when Wilson entered the bloody arena as the champion of the downtrodden and unprotected nationalities. Their two thousand years well-nigh of suffering faded into the background, all their experiences with blasted hopes and bitter disillusionments were forgotten, and they saw only the alluring mirage of Wilsonian promises. In this man and his Allied confrères they trusted implicitly, swathing their ardent hopes for emancipation in Wilson's deluding verbiage. And because their faith in the Allies was so complete they threw themselves into the conflict against Germany with a wonderful enthusiasm, sacrificing as no one else, giving readily of their money and their lives, fight-

ing with unparalleled bravery in the ranks of the Allied armies, even there where mothers, wives, and daughters were brutally ravished or murdered at home while fathers and sons fought and died on the field of battle. It was indeed a pathetic manifestation of the confiding simplicity of human nature.

Today, however, the Jews are disillusioned, at least as to Wilson and the Allies, for they have been awakened from their sanguine dream by the rude hand of a pitiless reality. To the several million of them living in Eastern Europe the "war for democracy" has brought not freedom and justice but greater misery and keener humiliation. The reward for the sacrifices they made is pogroms, and more pogroms. In short—another betrayed people. So that by now they have had sufficient opportunity to become thoroughly disgusted with the Allied clique; and there are only a very few Jews who still have the courage to sing psalms of praise to the Allied statesmen, and that not because of gratitude or faith in them but rather as a last vain attempt to induce them to take some action in behalf of their abandoned brethren in Eastern Europe.

UNTIL A BRIGHTER DAWN

A last vain attempt! Is the attempt really vain? Can the Jews hope for nothing from the rulers of the world? Will the Powers remain deaf to the agonized cry that comes from Eastern Europe? It is the firm though sad conviction of the writer that for their full measure of freedom the Jews must wait until a brighter dawn appears on the horizon in Eastern Europe; that is, until a fundamental change occurs in the economic and political life of those countries where the Jews are oppressed. Anti-semitism is a natural concomitant to the politico-economic system prevailing there, and it can be done away with finally only by the elimination of that system. So long as there is a privileged, inefficient ruling class incapable of solving the distressing economic problems in Eastern Europe, the Jew will be made use of as a scapegoat to divert the attention of the discontented masses from the real source of their troubles. Russia under the Tsar served as a classic example in this respect. Today Poland and Rumania have assumed the rôle.

Yet it lies in the power of the governments of England, the United States, and France to prevent, at least to a great extent, the violent expressions of anti-semitism by compelling the governments of the East European countries to recognize the rights of their Jews and to lend them the aid of the state against pogroms. And while there exists a possibility, however faint, of securing even a small degree of emancipation for their abused brethren, the Jews will continue to clamor for it. It is the peculiarity of their situation that no matter how disappointed or how angered they may be by the failure of others to keep promises or to treat their people honorably, they still dare not utter their outraged feelings too loudly; in a certain sense they are more completely helpless and at the mercy of others than any other national group. The Irish, the Hindus, or the Koreans protest, denounce, defy, even rebel. The Jews may not do more than plead, beseech, petition. These are the mild weapons with which they must content themselves when approaching

those who cause all their sufferings or the mighty who govern the world. And now they will have recourse to these weapons again. They will agitate, they will hold mass meetings, convene congresses, create commissions, and place polite, diplomatically worded memorials on their rights and grievances before the unfeeling, hard-hearted, utterly selfish and self-seeking statesmen of the Holy Entente.

With hard work and effort they may achieve somewhat for their fellow-Jews who are abused and discriminated against. But it would be well for them to bear in mind that whatever the Allies will do for them will not be due to noble motives or altruistic ideals. To stimulate the Allies into action in the interests of the oppressed Jews the strongest pressure from a united Jewry is necessary—the absolutely strongest pressure that can be brought to bear with the limited means at the disposal of the Jewish people. Of course, the effectiveness of the pressure will be conditioned by the degree of organization among the Jews. Hence the greatest and most important duty that will confront the American Jewish Congress when it is reconvened for its second session in the near future will be to inaugurate the work of organizing the Jews of the world on an international basis.

Pogroms and Zionism

THE latest figures we have received show that by a conservative estimate one hundred thousand Jews have perished in pogroms in the Ukraine. No exact figures are yet available as to the number of the slain or the extent of persecution of the Jews while the anti-semitic governments of Generals Kolchak and Denikin still cumbered the earth. In Poland probably not over four hundred Jews have actually perished in pogroms, but life is made a living hell for them by economic and social discrimination; in a country where hunger is general the Jews fare worst. All the governments we have named (as Mr. Glassman points out in his article above) had the support of the Allies. To a non-Jew it would seem as if the Allied endorsement of Zionism hardly balanced the account. Indeed, is not the future of Zionism rather precarious? Originally endorsed by the British foreign secretary, Arthur Balfour, it achieved the immediate object of securing the invaluable aid of enthusiastic Jewish support for the Allied cause. There is more than a little ground to suspect that it also achieved the purpose of enabling the British to go back on the none-too-credible secret treaty which they had negotiated with the French for the division of Syria. What it has actually done for the Jews is less evident. Neither is it clear what chance Zionism will have against the rising feeling of nationalism in Syria. It must be remembered that the Jews are still a minority in Palestine. No one ought to object to their desire for a homeland, but it would be most unfortunate if that desire made them the pawns of imperialist diplomacy and diverted the more idealistic of them from their function as true internationalists.

The Court-Martial System in the American Army

By SAMUEL TILDEN ANSELL

The grotesquely unjust and feudal court-martial system which General Ansell exposed in no uncertain terms in the two public speeches portions of which are here published, has governed four million of our citizens during the War. Is it to continue? It will unless a popular pressure for change is exerted on Congress sufficient to counteract the tremendous opposing pressure of the War Department and the Regular Army. Remember that these same militarists now seek universal military training, which will bring all young Americans under their barbarous code.

NOTWITHSTANDING the glorious deeds our Army did during the war just past, it did not do justice to its soldiery. I say more: Under the existing military code it is impossible to do justice. The system which now obtains, and which has ever obtained in our Army, not only does not establish justice, it permits of injustice,—indeed, leads logically and inevitably to injustice. This we should have seen, as I labored unsuccessfully to get our authorities to see, in the first days of the War, and for it they should have sought correction. Our Army got its instruction, its discipline, and preserved its fighting spirit not because of, but in spite of, our system of military justice. The achievement of our soldiery is conclusive evidence of, is an imperishable tribute to, the quality of American citizenship which would not be crushed by the archaic, cruel, and un-American system of military justice which, sad to say, it had to endure.

OUR HOARY MILITARY CODE

The injustice meted out to our soldiery during this War is due to the great controlling fact that the military code is not a code of Law. It is not worthy of the name of Law in any enlightened sense of that word. It is law only in the sense that established and tolerated tyranny is law. It came to us, unwittingly, out of a system of government and from an age in which the Army belonged to the King and was governed through his personal power and by his will, or by his officers to whom his power was delegated. He and his officers were the overlords and to them the soldiers belonged as retainers, to do their bidding as servants or slaves. We have for our code the British code of 1774, which was itself of much more ancient origin and which England has long since discarded. Hastily and to meet an emergency our Congress adopted it word for word during our Revolution, and has continued it by statutory declaration to that effect until now but slightly modified. John Adams, the statesman who secured its adoption, said that the British Articles of War were but a literal translation of the Roman and that what was good enough for those two fighting Empires was good enough for us. Britain has moved far forward since that day, but we, with our ultra-conservative military establishment and our people without interest in the Army, have stood where we were.

Such is the code we have today. Our military authorities revere, even worship, its age and origin. Winthrop, our highest authority on military law,

says with great pride that the military code "stands alone among our public statutes in retaining many provisions and forms of expression dating back from two to five hundred years." The present Judge Advocate General, in proposing in 1912 a revision that did not revise except in the sense of some verbal changes, frequently stated that our Articles of War are the ancient British Articles and declared time and time again that, "We are governing the Army under a very ancient code." And, unfortunately, Secretaries of War, through lack of information or independence, or through reluctance to resist departmental bureaucracy, acquiesce in its continuance.

The military code is a criminal code applying to the conduct of every man in the Army. Under it a soldier is triable for every offense, from murder down. Are you content that the criminal laws of England of two hundred or even five hundred years ago—an age when criminals or unfortunates suspected of being criminals were treated with brutish severity—should govern us now? Are you content that the feudal laws which regulated the relations of the military serf to his overlord in that far-away age should now govern the relation of our citizen to our state when he serves it as a soldier? Of course not! Yet that is our situation, and if one had the power to do justice to this great subject and had access to the people, they would be convinced that such is our true condition; and being convinced, they would surely insist that Congress must immediately break away from it.

LAW AN INCIDENT OF COMMAND

I bid you look at this feudal system as it remains with us in its finest flower. The military code is a penal code. It includes all offenses from the highest to the lowest. It provides for all punishments from death down. It applies to every man in the Army. Four million citizens have recently been subjected to it. In the short space of a year in the war period it ground out some twenty-eight thousand general court-martial cases and some three hundred and twenty thousand minor ones; more offenses, doubtless, than were tried in all the criminal courts of the United States! And yet this code that deprives the soldier of his life, his liberty, his property, just as completely and effectually as can be done by any civil tribunal on earth, neither contemplates nor requires the services of a single judge or a single person skilled in the law. This whole system of penal law is administered entirely by military men as an incident or prerogative of Military Com-

mand. Before a citizen in civilian life can be sentenced to die or to undergo a long term of imprisonment, all the judicial functions seated in the authority of our people are brought into play and devoted to the application of rules of law meticulously designed to do justice and demanding absolute compliance. But a citizen serving the State as a soldier goes to his death as a result of the functions of military command, served by no judge, guided by no principles of jurisprudence. Justice under such a system is but an incident of and subordinate to the absolute power of military command.

Look at our so-called courts-martial. They are not courts. Notwithstanding that they try for every offense known to the law of the land and the military profession, they are composed of purely military men knowing not one word of law, and neither controlled nor advised by any man who does know one word of law. Let us consult our common sense. Army officers, like other men, can judge facts, but who would expect them to be fit judges of law? As a matter of fact, they are trained away from law and legal appreciations. And yet this kind of court either ignores, or presumes to pass upon, every question of law that can or ought to arise in the progress of a criminal proceeding. In the first instance, it determines the legal sufficiency of the accusation, the legal validity of all pleas and objections, the admissibility of all evidence; it passes upon every right of the accused placed on trial and comes to such finding and awards such punishment as it sees fit. I say it passes upon all of these questions only in the first instance, because these army men are responsible to the Commanding Officer who appointed them to conduct the trial, and he, the absolute and final power, may overrule them or instruct them to do other than they have done, or, in many instances, may substitute his judgment for theirs.

SUPREME POWERS OF THE MILITARY OFFICER

Of course such a trial is not, cannot be, a trial in accordance with principles of law. The only law which these military men need regard is their own sense of the requirements of the situation and the will of their Commanding Officer. Not one of them knows any law; neither does the commanding officer; and yet whatever the court does, whatever ruling it makes when concurred in by the commanding officer, becomes fixed and final beyond all review. And their blunders are ridiculous blunders with tragic consequences.

Again, any commissioned officer can prefer a charge or accusation against any enlisted man he pleases, and nineteen-twentieths of the time the charge preferred results in a trial. Here, where the flood of injustice should be dammed at its source,

the flood-gates are open. The code does not require a thorough preliminary investigation. If it did so provide, one-half of the charges now tried would never be tried at all. The commanding officer makes only such preliminary investigation as he pleases. He decides that the case shall or shall not be tried, as he pleases; in ninety-six cases out of a hundred he decides that it shall be tried. The commanding officer assigns as counsel for the

accused any officer he pleases; usually some timid lieutenant whose chief accomplishment is to complete the Government's case. Quite as a senior judge advocate in France wrote me: "In reviewing a court-martial case nowadays always look first to the case for the defense. You are more than apt to find the Government's case made out by some fool counsel for the accused. During the trial the court does as it pleases, except in so far as the commanding officer requires it to do as he pleases. And in the end, the officer commanding the court approves or disapproves what the court did, just as he pleases."

There are in the code forty-two punitive articles.

Not one of them defines the offense, not one of them specifies the penalty. In most cases the definition of the crime is left to be determined by what professional soldiers may regard as contrary to the custom of the service and as harmful to the honor of the Army. Twenty-nine of these articles prescribe that the offense therein denounced "shall be punished as the court-martial may direct." Under such authority the court may award any punishment it pleases, except death, and for the slightest offense may, if it is so disposed, award a sentence of life imprisonment. Eleven of these articles prescribe that the offense denounced therein "shall be punished by death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct." And two articles make death mandatory. The court, knowing that its own judgment is subject to the approval or disapproval of the commanding general, does not exercise its discretion, but, having such latitude of authority to punish, it places the bar so high that the commanding officer may let it down as far as he pleases without permitting of any escape. Thus at one and the same time the so-called court passes up its own responsibility to a single man, pays pretty deference to its commanding general, and still further enhances the beauty of this "Do-as-you-please" plan.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR SEES NO INJUSTICE

No wonder court-martial results have been grotesquely unjust. In his open letter of March 1, 1919, the Secretary of War was induced to say that he did not believe that injustice had been done by courts-martial during this War. Now, in the first place, I have no doubt in the world but that

"Our military code is neither modern nor American. It is a feudal institution. Are you content that the criminal laws of England of two hundred or even five hundred years ago should govern us now? Are you content that the feudal laws which regulated the relations of the military serf to his overlord in that far-away age should now govern the relation of our citizen to our state when he serves it as a soldier? That is our situation."

SAMUEL TILDEN ANSELL

when the Secretary of War said that, he had been imposed upon. In any event, he must know otherwise now. The last report of the Special Clemency Board, while I was the President, showed that of 3,976 cases passed upon in a period from February 24th to June 4th, clemency was extended in 3,465 cases, or 87.165 per cent. of the total; and that sentences to confinement aggregating 28,040 years were reduced to 6,724 years, a reduction of 76.11 per cent. This, in and of itself, conclusively establishes injustice. Clemency, however, is not the remedy in case of unlawful conviction. Clemency proceeds upon the predicate of guilt. It is forgiveness of sin. Justice in the case of a man unlawfully convicted requires that the judgment be reversed or set aside. The War Department denies that the Judge Advocate General of the Army or any other earthly authority has or should have any such power. So hundreds of unlawful convictions, when tested by rules of law, must stand forever uncorrected.

LIFE IMPRISONMENT FOR A MORON

Here are one or two examples of the many thousands of cases of grotesque injustice that passed through my office or which have been called to my attention. The accused was a young man of twenty-three years, convicted of absence without leave, desertion, and escape. He was "defended" by a lieutenant as counsel who apparently did no more than bear the label. The evidence for the Government consisted of the brief testimony of the captain and sergeant. The counsel stood by, rendering no apparent assistance, while the witnesses were led to say just what the charges had alleged the accused had done. There was no testimony whatever for the accused. The court sentenced the man to be dishonorably discharged, to forfeit all pay and allowances due, and to be confined at hard labor for ninety-nine years. The division commander took occasion in his orders to commend the court for having done their duty in awarding a substantial sentence and then, rather naively I thought, suspended the execution of the sentence of dishonorable discharge while the accused was serving his ninety-nine-year confinement! It turns out also in this case that the man is mentally defective, having the mind of a child of no more than nine years, and is unfit for assignment to any military duty; even at the time of the trial he must have been afflicted with a progressive disease productive of hunchback.

In another case the accused was convicted of disobeying an order to "take your rifle and go out and drill," and escaping from confinement, for which he was sentenced to be dishonorably discharged and to be confined at hard labor for thirty years, which the convening authority reduced to twenty. In another case of absence without leave for three months, the accused was sentenced to twenty years, which was reduced to ten. In another case of absence without leave for six weeks, the accused testified, and it was not denied, that he went home to see a young wife and baby who were sick and having difficulty in keeping body and soul together. He was sentenced to confinement at hard labor for fifteen years, which was reduced to three. In another case of absence without leave

for three months, the accused was sentenced to confinement at hard labor for twenty-five years, which was reduced to ten. In another case, however, for minor insubordination, the accused was sentenced to hard labor for fifty years, which the reviewing authority declined to reduce.

WHAT THE RECORDS SHOW

An examination of the records will show to the satisfaction of any lawyer seeking to ascertain the truth rather than to support the existing system in accordance with the desires of the War Department, (a) that sixty per cent. of the general courts-martial cases should never have been tried at all; (b) that according to a reasonable common-sense and untechnical standard sixty per cent. of the cases were not well tried; (c) that fifteen per cent. were so poorly tried that the record cannot be relied on at all; and (d) that in seventy-five per cent. of the convictions the punishment awarded was such as to shock the conscience. Such a record is disgraceful, ought to be corrected, and should never occur again.

Lack of legal control is the difficulty. Lack of legal control at the top, lack of legal control at the bottom, lack of legal control throughout the proceedings. Instead of legal control, we have in our system the control of those inherently judicial functions by the power of military command. Will this system be changed? Not if the War Department and its bureaucrats have their way. And they are a strong combination with large influence with the Military Committee of Congress.

The House Committee on Military Affairs has had the time to make Pershing a general for life, to reward many others who insist upon the retention of this archaic, unjust system, to "reorganize" the Army, and do a thousand things the War Department has asked it to do; but it has had no time to consider even for one moment the Chamberlain-Johnson Bill for the establishment of justice in the Army, notwithstanding that that bill has been before the Committee for almost a year.

THE epidemic of influenza has brought once more to the attention of New Yorkers the magnificently intelligent and self-sacrificing service of the district nurses. The city owes to Miss Wald, to the nurses of her organization, and to Henry Street Settlement a debt it cannot pay, not only for practical service, but for continuing proof of the real kindness in human hearts. We hope that the campaign for \$1,000,000 to maintain and extend this nursing service will more than attain its goal. Checks may be sent to V. Everitt Macy, Treasurer, 265 Henry Street, New York City.

IN times when the church seems slow to arouse itself to its social duty, it is a pleasure to record such hopeful signs of the Christian spirit as are manifest by the growth of the Church League for Industrial Democracy. Other communions than the Episcopal might profitably form such organizations. We urge our readers to avail themselves of the opportunity (offered in the advertisement of the League which we carry in this issue) to get the literature of the movement.

The Way They Live

By LOUISA SARGENT

SHE was a little woman with a thin face and light blue, wistful eyes. Her mouth was tired and drawn and drooped a little at the corners, but she held out her hand and greeted me with a cheerful smile.

"I am so glad to meet you," she said; "I am always glad to meet Arthur's teachers. I hope he is a good boy, because I want my boys to get a good education. I had to stop when I was in the Sixth grade, so I want my boys to keep on going. I think Jimmy is going to be an artist and Walter a musician. I hope so; I always wanted to have a musician in the family. When we was in Wyoming I tried to get an organ, but I never have yet."

"Ah, and so you lived in Wyoming," I said, "and is it not a wonderful country?"

"Oh, yes, we lived there many years, and sometimes I wish we had never went away. I was there eighteen years: I was married there and three of my boys born there. It is a grand country; sometimes I want so much to go back. My husband was a miner there and that is a hard life. A miner can't get anywhere, working all the time for somebody else. This is a better country here; it is more prosperous. It is hard getting work here in the winter, but it is not as bad as there. Work is so hard to get; sometimes there were no work at all, all summer long. We left there nearly three years ago. Before that my husband got only three dollars a day. He worked eight hours a day and some overtime, so part of the time he got three-fifty a day. That is not very much. We lived in one of the company houses and paid fifteen dollars a month rent. Besides the rent, we paid a dollar and a half for coal and the same amount for light. Yes, we had electricity in all the houses. We did not care so much for it, but it was put in whether we wanted it or not, and we had to pay for it, so we used it. Then we had to pay a dollar and a half a month for hospital, and that paid all the doctor bills. We paid all that to the company. Then there was a dollar and a half union dues. My husband joined the union five times because he couldn't always keep up his dues when work was slack, and that was fifty dollars altogether. But we didn't grudge the money, because the union is such a good thing. It is the only help the miner has. Sometimes in a neighboring mine there would be a strike and the men in our union would be taxed fifty cents a month extra, but we never grudged that money either because we knew we were helping somebody.

"But when the money for rent and coal and light was taken out every other Saturday night when my husband got his pay, there wasn't much left. One month we had only five dollars left after those bills were paid. That five dollars was for groceries and clothes. But that month we didn't buy no clothes. That time we had a little garden and some chickens and they helped some. But five dollars is not much to get along on for a month.

"The papers say that miners waste their money, but it isn't true. They don't have any to waste.

"And the papers are always saying what big pay the miners get. That is true; some of them do get big pay. A miner will sometimes get twelve dollars a day for working underground. But that is only in winter. Only three months in winter. And bow can twelve dollars a day, six days a week for three months spread over all the other nine months of the year?

"Yes, and they say that miners drink a lot. Everybody says that, but it isn't true. Of course you know that there are beasts everywhere, and some of the men do drink too much, but I never saw a drunk miner more than once or twice—even the foreigners. And you know how they are sometimes. They are used to having wine and beer where they come from. But they don't hardly ever get what you might say drunk. It isn't true to say they do.

"They say that miners are lazy and ask for too short hours, but listen to this: Sometimes the men in the mines work twelve hours a day; four hours of that is overtime. They don't mind that; they like to work overtime; it gives them more money. They are not lazy. You do not understand why they want shorter hours? This is it. Sometimes men who are out of work come to the mine and beg and beg for something to do. I have seen them beg for work with tears in their eyes. But they can't get it because there the mines are full of men who are working overtime. It is the union that wants shorter hours for the men so that more men can get work and more families will be provided for.

"And what can the men do when the mine isn't running? Sometimes they stay in the camps, because it costs so much to move away to a place where there is other work, and so much to move back when the mine is open in the fall, that they will be in debt. In Wyoming sometimes the men can herd cattle on the big ranches in the summer. Some summers my husband did; he got forty-five dollars a month and his board. But I stayed at the camp with the children. Sometimes even when the mine is going it runs only two days a week, or three. We think we are lucky and are glad if we hear that whistle blow three mornings a week. It means work, and that is what we want. But if a miner goes away some days when there isn't work, and isn't always on hand when the whistle blows, he loses his job altogether. He must be on hand all the time.

"This is a poor house we are staying in now, but I wish you could see a miner's cottage. It is such a little thing. We had a three-room house and paid fifteen dollars a month for it. The kitchen is just nothing but a lean-to shed. Sometimes the kitchens are ceiled, sometimes not. Ours wasn't—just the bare rafters. We kalsomined the rafters, but the company wouldn't furnish the kalsomine as

A Plea for the Churches

BY ONE OF THEIR FRIENDS

THE following is a condensation of a "Babson Report," dated Wellesley Hills, Mass., January 27, 1920.

What is our real security for the stocks, bonds, mortgages, deeds and other investments which we own? Think how dependent you are on the guards of the safe-deposit vault which holds your all. Before the clerk gives you your key, is there anything to prevent him making a duplicate of that key? Moreover, he is probably working for a comparatively small salary. Let us now consider upon what the value of the papers within the box depends. It is the integrity of the men who prepared them, the integrity of the officials who signed them and the integrity of the bankers who sold them.

You may have a mortgage on my house. Your mortgage is of value only as everyone connected with it—the lawyer who drew it—the notary who acknowledged it—and the little stenographer who copied it, up to the jury which is to enforce it, is honest.

All this means that the real security for the stocks, bonds, mortgages, deeds and other investments which we own is the integrity of the community. . . . The value of our investments depends not on the strength of our banks, but rather upon the strength of our churches. The underpaid preachers of the nation are the men upon whom we really are depending rather than the well-paid lawyers, bankers and brokers. The religion of the community is really the bulwark of our investments. And when we consider that only 15% of the people hold securities of any kind and less than 3% hold enough to pay an income tax, the importance of the churches becomes even more evident.

For our own sakes, for our children's sakes, for the nation's sake, let us business men get behind the churches and their preachers! Never mind if they are not perfect, never mind if their theology is out of date. This only means that were they efficient they would do very much more. The safety of all we have is due to the churches, even in their present inefficient and inactive state. By all that we hold dear, let us from this very day give more time, money and thought to the churches of our city, for upon these the value of all we own ultimately depends!

ROGER W. BABSON.

The War Department also is among the staunchest friends and supporters of the church. It also has its own reason. We quote from a recent letter of the Adjutant General to the clergy of the United States: "The part the clergy played in sustaining the morale of the army and of the nation during the World War is beyond computation. It is earnestly desired that the interest and enthusiasm shown throughout the emergency may now be manifested toward the permanent army." The same circular also urges ministers to cooperate in the essay contest in the public schools on the subject of the advantages of enlisting in the army. We seem to remember that once we met a minister who said this was a "war to end war."

THE EDITOR.

some companies do. We had to furnish our own. Besides the kitchen, there are two other rooms; no closets. The bedroom is just big enough for a bed and a dresser and a trunk; that was all. Then there was one other room.

"Some of the cottages have only two rooms, but they are just shacks—nothing but shells built with the boards going straight up and down. The four-room houses were better, but they were just square with four big rooms. No closets, no place to keep things—just four big rooms.

"Once they opened up a big mine near us and built cottages for several hundred miners' families. The houses had four rooms and cost two hundred dollars each. They were rented for twenty-two dollars a month. Three-room houses rented for fifteen, and the two-room shacks for ten. It never cost much to build them, and in two or three years the rent of the houses paid for them. A four-room house would be paid for by rent in one year.

"But you couldn't buy a house from the company on the instalment plan. No, and if you bought it at all you had to move it from the company's grounds.

"We generally bought all of our supplies at the company store. But they asked the highest prices, so sometimes I would go into the city and get things. I would go on the street-car and could save more than enough on two or three articles to pay my carfare. The company didn't like that, though; they wanted us to buy from them, to pay our house-rent to them, to buy our fuel from them, and our lights and our hospital care.

"Do you think the miners have such an easy time and do they make so much money? Can they save money on what they get? Well, yes, if they are lucky, and can get work when the mine is open, and are careful. Once we had two hundred dollars saved up. But it was hard work.

"And what could the company do to make it easier? Well, the first thing they could do is to lower that house rent. It is too much. Fifteen dollars for a little three-room house! They are not worth it, and the rent pays for them in such a little while.

"The union is the best thing we have and miners stick together longer than any other workers. They are the best of all. They would not have given up in this last strike if they had not been accused of being disloyal to the government. All the papers and everybody said they were disloyal. They didn't want to seem disloyal; they didn't want anybody to think them so, so they gave it up. They are not disloyal."

So that is the way they live, and that is the reason I could tell the first time I saw her that she was worn out and old—worn out and old and disheartened and not yet thirty-five.

We desire to extend a belated but cordial welcome to our new contemporary, *The Socialist Review*, published by the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. It is not in itself a journal of opinion, but as its name indicates a review of Socialist and labor thoughts and practice. The high character of the first three numbers warrants bright hopes for its future.

The Stockholders Statement

Some Criticisms and Suggestions

THE Stockholders' Statement originally published in our February issue has, in addition to wholehearted approval, brought some interesting comments from our readers which we shall endeavor to summarize briefly.

I. Disapproval: This comes from radicals on one side and conservatives on the other. Certain of our radical friends argue that it is a waste of time to appeal to stockholders; that stockholders will not respond; that what the situation requires is the entire abolition of the profit system. Various suggestions have been sent us as to ways of doing this. To discuss them is not germane to our present purpose. We can only repeat that it was not our intention in proposing this statement to lay down a rigorous method of social reconstruction or to secure entire agreement with any of the various radical economic proposals which now contend for the world's approval, but to emphasize the value of a spirit among stockholders which might make easier the actual work of building a new economic order. If any considerable number of stockholders will make up their minds to seek "the highest good of the workers and the community at large" regardless of personal loss to themselves, something will be accomplished toward diminishing the area and intensity of the strife of classes.

Our conservative friends, on the other hand, argue that our statement contains "no adequate recognition of the essential value to the community of saving." Without private ownership of capital, they say, there can be no saving from income to provide capital for new enterprises. Frankly, this seems to us a dubious position, especially from a Christian standpoint. What the private control of capital means is manifest at every turn in the present condition of the world. It is therefore a terribly pessimistic conclusion to believe that things must go on much as they now are because only by the autocracy and inequality of the present profit system can capital be secured for industry. But we are concerned less to argue this point than to call attention to the fact that the Stockholders' Statement does not declare that all private saving or even all investment shall be abolished. It simply declares that the control of industry by absentee owners or by stockholders who contribute no labor of hand or brain must be ended, and furthermore that it is the first duty of industry to support the workers. We should imagine that even those who believe the profit system is at bottom sound and only needs reformation might agree with so moderate a statement.

II. Questions and suggestions: One of our correspondents thinks that we have discriminated a bit unfairly against (or is it in favor of?) stockholders in raising ethical problems for them to the exclusion of bondholders, landlords, and the like. Surely it is no part of our intention to imply that anyone who receives profits does not need to search

his soul as to the legitimacy of that profit; but our particular intention in this statement was to arouse thought on problems of control of industry which rest theoretically in the hands of stockholders, not of bondholders.

One of the most thoughtful letters we have received raises two points which are decidedly worth passing on to our readers. (1) "Control ought to be so founded that it would not be possible for one group of workmen to exploit their industry to the disadvantage of the consuming public generally.

... Means for representation of consumers is as much an object to work for as is means for the representation of labor." The point seems to us well taken. The tendency of the workers in England and America to favor nationalization of mines with democratic management is in line with this suggestion. We do not, however, feel that our statement with regard to control passing from the stockholders into the hands of those who work is inconsistent with the protection of the legitimate interests of consumers. We are here concerned not with the conflicting interests of men as producers and as consumers, but with the clash in interest between those who derive power and comfort from their ownership of stock and those who actually work with hand and brain. (2) "With the transfer of control from the owners of capital should go insurance systems providing for adequate care of those who now normally depend on capital for such care." To this, at least as a temporary measure in a period of readjustment, we should agree, and it seems to us consistent with the Statement, which expressly provides that the good of the community at large ought to be one of the factors in determining the course of action of stockholders.

Our main purpose is to get men and women thinking by means of a somewhat concrete statement of the general attitude stockholders ought to be willing to take in view of the responsibility that is theirs. In England a similar movement has already resulted in the formation of a stockholders' association. Just what practical achievement can be effected by such an association we do not know, but we can conceive that it would have real value in stimulating and guiding those who are willing to cooperate in working out a better social order even at the cost of their own personal or class interests. For the benefit of those who have not heretofore seen the statement on which we are commenting we reprint it in full. What further action is taken depends entirely upon the response that comes from our readers.

We, the undersigned, in view of our responsibility as stockholders and beneficiaries through shares in corporations, feel compelled to state our conviction:

1. That the first charge on industry should be the adequate and honorable compensation of those engaged in it.
2. That the ultimate control in industry should pass

from the owners of capital to those who work by hand or brain.

In so far as we may have power or influence we will use it to carry this belief into effect in the determination of questions concerning wages and working conditions in those companies in which we hold stock. Furthermore, we will seek and support such reorganization of industry as will promote the highest good

even though it may mean the ultimate disappearance of any separate class of shareholders, and we are prepared to accept such personal loss as may arise from this process of reorganization. We invite the cooperation of all stockholders to this end.

All who are willing to sign the above statement or have comment to make on it are asked to communicate with THE WORLD TOMORROW.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

A Report on Our Fund for Austrian and German Children

JUST a little report to you on the purchase of wool and cod-liver oil which included the amounts contributed through you for those two purposes. In December we sent to Hamburg on the S. S. *Kerolec* six cases of natural gray knitting yarn with a net weight of 3,071 lbs., this being forwarded to the Friends Service Committee in Berlin.

In January we forwarded twelve barrels of cod-liver oil, and since then more of this has been ordered. We have been hoping to receive some stories from Germany about the use of this in special cases, but thought we would not wait longer to make this first report; and as we have especially asked our Chief of Unit to forward us some details for you, we trust that we shall have them later.

Our feeding program is now well under way with quite a number of cities—Berlin, Dresden, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Leipzig, Chemnitz, Breslau, etc. Perhaps the situation in Dresden is typical,—25,000 undernourished children were found in that city, and from these the 3,000 most desperately needy ones have been selected to receive one extra meal a day of 667 calories. We are using the standard proportion of foodstuffs worked out by Mr. Hoover's organization for his child-feeding program in other countries in order to give a balanced meal.

A special appeal came to our Chief of Unit for diaper cloth for little babies. We have sent 4,300 yards of this, and he has written us that if multiplied a thousand times this would not meet the need.

Our workers find a desperate need of clothing as well as food. We have just sent off one hundred cases containing clothing, cloth, soap, etc.

WILBUR K. THOMAS,
Executive Secretary,
American Friends Service Committee.

Is There a Just Wrath?

YOUR correspondent E. C., Boston, Mass., says to you exactly what I have had on my mind to say for some time past. There is so much bitterness, intolerance, and harsh sarcasm in the world that it seems to me far safer for such a journal as *THE WORLD TOMORROW* to trust its message to the spirit of love—the "Greatest Thing in the World," and the most powerful and far-reaching.

Berkeley, California. ELIZABETH M. GRISCOM.

To this we agree, but we should welcome suggestions as to just how Love acts when it faces lies masking in the garb of truth and stupid auto-criticism vaunting itself as patriotism. Has it no woe to pronounce on those who "call evil good, and good evil"; who "justify the wicked for a reward"; who cause not one but thousands of God's "little ones" to stumble and fall?

The Ethics of Strikes—Another Opinion

I AM glad that there is to be a symposium on the strike matter. My own ideas need clarifying I think, anyway. However, I cannot but feel that the use of the strike today has come definitely to be the use of force. To lay down one's tools as a quiet protest in the face of intolerable wrongs may indeed be considered the attitude of non-resistance, but to strike in order to bring about specific objects like the nationalization of mines, railways, etc., which can be secured in time through political action if wanted by a real majority of the people, is very clearly the employment of force to my mind. It subjects the general public to inconvenience and coercion as truly as does war, though of course less painfully.

R. S. B.

New York.

The Sport of Hunting Reds

TRAILING the "reds" has become an extremely joyful experience, according to some representatives of Southern Bourbonism. Super-patriots profess great pleasure in hunting down the so-called "had" people.

In the days of Russian Czarism it was not an unusual thing for the Czar's hirelings to break into the homes of peace-loving Russian peasants and drag out those who possessed the faculties of sound reasoning. The old order of Czarism has passed into oblivion in Russia; has its spirit become incarnate in more vigorous form in "democratic" America?

I quote from a letter of Mr. Meadory, agent of the Department of Justice, who describes with profound enthusiasm his encounters with "red" leaders in bringing them to "justice."

"We encountered no resistance, the red leaders submitting stoically to the arrest and detention. At one house my approach was harried, the man declining to permit a search of the premises. Even after I showed him my authority he refused to let us enter. Finally I had the detectives, who were my aides, shove him aside, and we looked the place over."

And this:

"The most amusing part of the thing was his wife, who was horror-stricken at our search. The last picture I retain of our long night of trailing the reds was this woman, disappearing through the skylight, emerging in her night garments upon a roof so cold that with a heavy overcoat I could hardly refrain from chattering and quaking."

Czarism begins to look like a pink-tea affair compared to what temporary office-holders are stooping to in America.

JOSEPH J. PADGUG.

Alabama.

Is Democracy a Fraud?

By ROBERT L. WOLF

Mr. Wolf's article is a clear analysis of a modern criticism of democracy which must be understood by forward-looking persons in these times of confused political thinking.

ONE of the most startling results of a war waged professedly for the propagation of democracy has been the partial or total disappearance of that institution all over the world, and its very great loss of prestige.

If this phenomenon were confined to conservative countries like France or the United States, it might be dismissed as a purely temporary reaction from the war. But countries in the control of radical forces, like Russia (and Hungary while the Bolshevik regime lasted) practice democracy scarcely more, and preach it even less, than those of the other group. Evidently one of our most orthodox political ideals is undergoing serious and widespread critical examination.

Democracy does not mean government in the interests of the majority. It does not mean merely selection of the government by the choice of the majority. What it implies chiefly is freedom of agitation—as Bernard Shaw once said, the enthronement of revolution as a constitutional procedure. The right and duty of minority criticism, the facilitation of the development of minorities into majorities, the creation of processes for the peaceful inauguration of complete changes of social policy,—these things are the essence of the philosophy of democracy as it was left us by the liberals of the nineteenth century.

THE BREAKDOWN OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

It needs little argument to show the abeyance of such democracy today in a country like the United States. Our Post Office spy system, with its "radical check lists" compiled by the interception of private correspondence and its rigid censorship of radical publications, our outlawry and persecution of organizations like the I. W. W., our Lusk committees, the Albany "trial" of the Socialist Assemblymen, the unseating of Berger, and our lynching of dissenters, are facts with which everyone is familiar. A general consensus of opinion in this country now distinguishes between liberty and license. Liberty in this interpretation is the right to advocate changes in the personnel of the government, or in its policy upon unimportant details; license is the attempt to alter fundamental social institutions, like property, patriotism, or marriage. Yet that is just what the philosophic liberalism of the last century pretended to protect.

It is a commonplace today, not only with extreme socialists but with radicals and liberals of all sorts, that the present century will witness a shift of the social center of power towards the working class, just as the last two centuries saw a change of control from the hereditary land-owning aristocracy to the business middle class. Is democracy, developed by the middle class for its own struggle, to be thrown to the winds in this new contest?

The controversies now raging over this question among radicals all over the world may seem ac-

ademic in the extreme to an outsider, but they will not be so insignificant to the historian of the future. The split between the International of Berne and the International of Moscow over the issue of democracy or proletarian dictatorship, the quarrel on this same point recently in progress in Chicago between the Communists and Left-Wing Socialists and the Socialists of the Right, the return to Marxism among Socialists of every type, are the straws which show which way the radical wind is blowing. And the radical wind of today—to make a very poor pun—is the popular clamor of tomorrow.

What is the cause of this sudden abandonment by a minority—such as the "class-conscious" radicals in most countries still remain—of the principle upon which minority activity seems to rest? Make all allowance for a natural tendency toward slavish imitation of the Russian revolution, against which Lenin himself has so carefully warned his followers, and for the general impatience and violence bred by the war, and the critics of democratic methods are still left with three main contentions in their support.

SOME VITAL FALLACIES OF THE LIBERAL ARGUMENT

In the first place, they claim, democracy is a fraud anyway, and will remain a fraud, until a new economic order has been achieved, at which time real democracy will for the first time be possible. The powers that control a modern state will never—in their very nature, can never—allow the unfettered exercise of the right to agitate. They are determined to prevent, not violent change merely, but fundamental change of any sort. Let them be never so liberal, an attack upon property or patriotism makes of them utterly ruthless and unscrupulous opponents. Why should the devil have all the good warcries, ask the radicals? Why should the heavy artillery always be left to the enemy? Why should it always be the friends of progress who shackle themselves hand and foot with philosophic scruples? Why should it be shocking for Lenin to establish a "property qualification" for the franchise and deprive business men of their votes when it is a matter of course for Woodrow Wilson to throw I. W. W.'s into jail?

Liberals will reply that they deprecate violence on the one side quite as much as on the other, and that they hope by reestablishment of the rules at least to keep the contest fair.

Fairness is utterly impossible, rejoined the radicals. Even though physical reprisals could be prevented, even though an enlightened spirit should bring to all classes a conception of the elementary meaning of tolerance, the distribution of power would remain unaffected. Political power in a modern community rests upon popular support; popular support is an economic commodity which can be manufactured at will by those who control the avenues of informa-

tion and propaganda. There is no need to charge conscious venality—the business and investing classes control the important organs of news quite as a matter of course, not only through ownership and advertising, but because the managers of public opinion are themselves recruited from the employing class, or from those who share the psychology, education, and background of that class.

In some lectures I once heard upon "public opinion and popular government," a well-known and conservative college president discoursed at some length upon the nature of "opinion." I think he demonstrated conclusively, at the end of an hour or so, that opinion could only properly be called such when it was based upon reasonably unbiased reports of the facts, and reasonably free opportunities for debate. Anyone who wishes to investigate for himself the extent to which modern society approximates this ideal need only read and compare, in the United States or England or France, an ordinary daily newspaper and one of those radical sheets that exist precariously and by sufferance upon the borders of the fourth estate. He will find not only the most utter bias in narrative and headline, but complete omission from the one paper of all the most important articles of news that appear in the other. And these articles are generally well authenticated and such as would provoke the interest, though they might ruffle the composure, of the readers of the orthodox journal. But a censorship, none the less rigid because it is unofficial, keeps these dangerous news items from the public.

THE "CLASS STRUGGLE" VIEWPOINT

Finally, there is the fundamental criticism that strikes most nearly at the root of the whole institution of modern democracy. At bottom, say the radicals, all issues spring from the class issue. First, foremost, and only, the way of progress must be the attainment of economic control by the propertyless classes, and the inauguration of a new classless regime based upon cooperation rather than upon economic stratification. This is the problem of the future, and the tactics of the future must be the tactics of war rather than of reform. It is too easy to drag a red herring across the trail when political methods are used; only when the industrial struggle proceeds in its own channels—by labor organization, by the strike, by violence, perhaps—are the issues kept clear. The workman strikes as a workman, say these advocates of class-consciousness; he votes as a citizen. The radicals feel that they have been so often betrayed by those who profess and call themselves socialists, but who seem to understand by socialism in practice anything except a program really affecting property, that they have developed a high degree of fear and intolerance for cooperation with those not completely in their own camp. And with this has come some contempt for the historic ideals of the "bourgeois state": individual liberty, freedom of speech and press, universal democratic suffrage.

Perhaps the most telling criticism of this point of view, save from those who prize democracy for its own sake, is to question whether it is not premature. Possibly the radicals underestimate the

strength of the opposition, are too hopeful of their own immediate success. If they are long destined to remain a minority, with the powers of reaction in control, it may be necessary once again for them to join forces with the liberals, and again to fight the battle for those avenues of freedom which they now deem unimportant. But the thorough-going radical replies that the waters of his propaganda can be muddied, but that they can never be prevented from flowing underground.

So the debate continues. This article is an endeavor not so much to force final judgment upon the controversy as to set forth arguments too often overlooked by the conventional believer in political democracy.

The Supreme Court and the Interests of Property

THE efficacy of the Supreme Court as defender of property rights rather than human liberty has been strikingly illustrated by recent decisions of our highest tribunal. The court, Justices Holmes and Brandeis dissenting, confirmed the conviction of several men for distributing the anti-war pamphlet "The Price We Pay." The same court by a majority of five to four denied the right of Congress to tax stock dividends. The latter decision means simply this: Any great corporation, let us say the Standard Oil Company, can refuse to distribute all its profits in the form of yearly dividends and let them keep on piling up. (It does not look well to declare too high dividends.) After enough of this surplus has been accumulated, it can be distributed to the stockholders in the form of new shares of stock. These stock dividends are not subject to the income tax because the court holds that they are not income, and therefore the Sixteenth Amendment did not give Congress a right to tax them.

The same court a few days previously decided that the Steel Corporation is a good trust and therefore not to be dissolved. The dissolution of trusts from the Standard Oil to the Packers' Monopoly has certainly not profited the ultimate consumer to a degree that will make him deplore the Court's decision with regard to the Steel Trust. Nevertheless, the combined effect of the decisions we have referred to will not serve to enhance the confidence of the people in the Court. In what sense is a country democratic in which a majority decision of one vote in a Court all of whose members are appointed for life can upset legislation duly enacted by Congress and generally approved by the people? The United States is unique among great nations in giving to the judiciary such extraordinary power. Our written constitution as interpreted by the courts makes it much more difficult in America than, let us say, in England to use political methods to bring about fundamental changes.

AS we go to press the full report of the Mine Commission has not been made public. The President is said to be endeavoring to effect an agreement between the majority and minority reports. It is understood that the majority report of the President's commission recommends a twenty-five per cent. increase to the miners, of which four-teen per cent. has already been granted.

Spying on Labor

ONE of the commonest devices of big corporations in fighting labor unions is the use of spies, stool pigeons, "under-cover men," and the like in factories and in the unions themselves. The purpose of this espionage is primarily to discover and fire "agitators" and in general to terrorize the workers. In time of strike spies sometimes serve as *agents provocateurs* and "frame-up" men. The existence of this system has been well known to the workers but hard to prove to those outside the labor movement. Fortunately recent events have served to bring it to public attention.

At a conference of workers of the Interchurch World Movement one of its prominent leaders reported that during the investigation of the steel strike conducted by the Movement an investigator was sent into the Pittsburgh district. We will suppose that his name was Brown. Whenever Mr. Brown went to a hotel he would discover that another Mr. Brown was registered in the same hotel; and always by accident messages and even letters intended for him would go to his namesake. That his namesake was a company spy was an irresistible conclusion. Through another official of the Interchurch World Movement we learn that their investigators found that some seventy of the reds rounded up by the Department of Justice were arrested on information given by the "under-cover men," that is, spies of the steel companies. So faulty was the work of the spies that the reds were afterwards released. But this kind of business helped to break the strike, and the Interchurch Movement has not yet given proper publicity to its experiences with Judge Gary's agents.

An even more complete exposure of the system has recently been made in Passaic, New Jersey. This is a "one-industry town" dominated by the Council of Wool Manufacturers. The workers are mostly foreign-born; thirty-five per cent. of the total population of Passaic cannot speak English; and therefore a survey of the problem of adult education was undertaken by the local school board in conjunction with the United States Bureau of Education. The investigator, Mrs. Alice Barrows Fernandez, is one of those uncommon people with common sense. In order to find out why the immigrant workers did not learn English she actually went to the workers themselves instead of to the Chamber of Commerce. She began operations by getting in touch with the Amalgamated Textile Workers. Later, when she called at the office of the School Superintendent, she found awaiting her a report giving a detailed and somewhat inaccurate account of her visit to union headquarters. She found on inquiry that this report had been made as a matter of routine by the spy system conducted for the benefit of the Wool Council under the direction of its Secretary, J. Frank Andres. Mrs. Fernandez is not "one of those foreign mill hands" and she happens to speak English with rare effectiveness, as Mr. Andres soon learned. He finally explained that of course what happened to her was a mistake. She was not content but carried matters

farther, and from two of the most prominent manufacturers in the Wool Council she got assurances that the espionage system was to be stopped. Under this impression she wrote her report, an admirable study both of immigration and education which now constitutes Bulletin No. 4, Series of 1920, Publications of the Bureau of Education of the Department of the Interior. (We give the title in question because the bulletin may be had on application and is well worth reading.) In this report Mrs. Fernandez quietly remarks that there can never be any good adult education so long as the espionage system prevails, since adult education is dependent upon a spirit of social cooperation quite incompatible with the suspicion and distrust created by the espionage system among the workers. "Fortunately," she adds, "it is understood that this undesirable system of espionage is to be abolished."

But unfortunately this undesirable system of espionage has not been abolished. On the contrary, in the Passaic papers of Friday, February 27th, Mr. J. Frank Andres (who in the midst of the controversy had been appointed a member of the Board of Education) attacks Mrs. Fernandez and the Amalgamated Textile Workers and attempts to justify the espionage system. Mrs. Fernandez had charged in a letter to the press that he had said: "Don't you think that a corporation worth \$20,000,000 ought to have some control of the policy of the public schools?" This Mr. Andres in the course of his advertisement takes pains to deny. In a second letter to the press Mrs. Fernandez repeats and emphasizes the charge that he said precisely that. There the matter rests for the present. The espionage system is not abolished, but there are these gains: First, in Passaic itself, Mr. George M. Hart, editor of the *Daily News*, has done some sound and able editorial writing in behalf of the principle of free speech and free assemblage. The Wool Council is on the defensive both at home and in Washington. Second, the more than Prussian policy of the city police toward the textile workers has been modified. It is still necessary for the union to get a permit to have a meeting, and the police still attend meetings, but the permit is easier to secure than heretofore. Finally, and best of all, Mrs. Fernandez, an accredited Government agent with the backing of the Bureau of Education, has brought to the light of day an abominable system wholly opposed not only to successful adult education, but to all decent relations in human society. If American middle-class public opinion does not end this espionage system with its consequent slavery, our democracy will indeed be an illusion.

THE Fellowship of Reconciliation has held a most interesting conference at Oskaloosa, Iowa. Particulars concerning it may be had from the western secretary, Rev. Noble S. Elderkin, 1317 Association Building, Chicago, Illinois.

Making a University Safe for Democracy

By Genevieve Taggard

EVERY Monday morning last spring a shabby young man stood at the magnificent Sather Gate entrance to the University of California. He was selling, or rather he was offering for sale, *THE WORLD TOMORROW*, *The Nation*, and *The Liberator*. A simple faith brought him there. He believed in the girls and boys who went so eagerly past him through the gate. Like many people in the outside world, he supposed that these boys and girls were going to the University because they wanted to know the truth about things. And because Herman Meyling understood such a desire, he came up and stood by the gate and greeted these people with his eyes, believing in them. So intent was his interest that he almost never saw their contemptuous glances. He kept right on believing in them, I think, until he saw the mob coming.

And even then he was only mildly remonstrative. Sophomores they were, who had been called up by the President's office only a few days before for defacing University property. A sort of wise glee came over them that morning when, out for a campus sensation, they saw Herman Meyling's stooped, shabby figure down by the gate. Shabby men, unduly earnest, with "ideas," offer more opportunities for fun than upper-class benches; and besides, Herman Meyling wasn't University property.

And so while the silken-clad among the co-eds halted their limousines and tooted their horns, the Sophomores burned Herman Meyling's papers and acted as all mobs, washed or unwashed, act.

Everybody approved. The Sophomore who had led the attack got quite a hand, almost as if he had made a touch-down. Will Irwin was speaking, at eleven o'clock that morning, and the University meeting was never so jubilant, so generous, so willing to give this rival college man a welcome. No one laughed, no one was amazed, no one even hesitated to join the burst of applause that came thundering up to him from that adolescent audience when he pled for "tolerance for all men and 'ideas,'" and appealed to the young people of the world to join the struggle for Social Justice. Will Irwin was a college man, and he wore a white collar.

Just outside the gate while he talked and the ten thousand applauded, the smoke from the Sophomore bonfire was still going up. Somewhere up in the hills behind the pretentious array of college halls, Herman Meyling was wandering, bruised, dismayed, robbed of his natural faith.

That was the beginning of the contemptuous persecution that followed Meyling about the college town. If he had been less mild, or more egotistical, this treatment would have turned him into a fiery fighter. But Meyling, quite unlike the rest of us, cared for nothing except the "better social order" that he had tried to get a hearing for. They put

him in jail several times, black-listed him, insulted him continually, and gradually bore down upon him that he was "queer."

That was what the college boys had against him. It was queer to care about anything enough to stand and make a joke of oneself. Anyway, it was queer for a grown man to sell papers. It was queer to sell weeklies—not for money—but because you believed in what they said. Anyway, something was queer. . . . Keeping on was.

Herman Meyling did keep on, but he nearly starved. And so when he went to jail the last time, in February, he got influenza. In his delirium all his heart-break must have had expression. At any rate, someone heard him and conceived of the solution to the whole problem. They took him out of bed—fever 105°—and stood him up before the insanity commission.

Next day the papers printed, and the college public read, believed, and clipped for its socialist friends the story of Herman Meyling's insanity.

This is the real story. But the story the newspapers printed involved a butcher knife and two pretty nurses. It was well fashioned to put quite an end to Herman Meyling. Several reporters must have pooled their brains in the frame-up.

Because no one who knows Herman Meyling doubts that it is a frame-up. *THE WORLD TOMORROW* has letters written by him since, and they are as sane, and as clear, and as wistful about his townspeople as ever. They say that he is mad. The same sort of people called Blake mad. The two men are not so different; I always remember Blake's poem about the boy who crushes the wings of flies when I think of Herman Meyling.

This is the way he puts it:

"I would attempt violence against no man, nor against any living creature so long as it was possible to avoid it. I would gladly go out of my way a block to avoid needlessly treading on a worm. The law of love is in the end more effective than the rule of hate."

When I think of all the dull lectures and all the well-meaning but unmeaning theses that are going to be given and written on the grand topic of Social Justice in that little academic City of Refuge, I also think of Herman Meyling. I think of him as he used to stand, just outside Sather Gate, greeting the younger generation with his mild blue eyes.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Mr. Meyling wrote us of his last arrest for the crime of selling or trying to sell forty copies of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* and four copies of *The Liberator* on the streets of San Francisco. He tells of his experiences before the insanity board, which fortunately did not declare him insane. He is now recuperating in the country.

Prisoners and Captives

II. A LUMBERJACK'S EXPERIENCES

In reading this plain, unvarnished tale of the brutality of our prisons we ask our readers to remember that the writer is a man whom the immigration authorities could not deport even under the excessive powers they now possess; yet although innocent of any crime he was forced to spend a year and five months of his life under the insupportable conditions he describes, and when released found himself three thousand miles from home, penniless and broken in health. His case is typical of many personally known to us. And it is thus that our government officials think to avert the so-called "red peril!"

I WAS arrested in the city of Seattle in December, 1917, for being a member of the I. W. W. and likely to become a public charge at the time of my arrest (though I had \$225 in my possession when I was arrested). First I was taken to the City Jail and from there transferred to the Immigration station where I was kept for several days. I was then moved to the Everett County Jail where I was confined until July 2, 1918, when I was again moved back to the Immigration station in Seattle.

During my confinement in the Everett County Jail we were compelled to go on a hunger strike for more and better food. After four days, during which time the deputy brought up the fire hose as the last resort to break our spirit, they finally granted our demands.

I was moved back to Seattle on July 2nd. On the 25th of July I was again moved with six other fellow-workers to the Chehalis County Jail. Here we were put into cells, four men in a cell. The jail has no window except a small opening at the front.

On our arrival the 25th day of July, we started a hunger strike for the same reason as before. The strike lasted nine days and the Sheriff also tried the hose upon us but without success. We were again moved back to the station at Southbend, Washington. The hunger strike was continued here for three days more, and resulted in our winning our demand for three meals a day.

In October one of our fellow-workers got the 'flu'. Realizing something must be done at once, we got busy with our cups, pounding the cell doors to get the jailer. The sheriff came in and asked:

"What in hell is the matter with you fellows?"

We spoke up, saying: "We have a man here dying with the flu."

"I do not give a God damn," said the Sheriff, "there are no doctors in town, so he will have to get along the best way he can."

"Well, Sheriff," said we, "that kind of an answer don't go with us as this man is our fellow-worker. We must have a doctor if we have to pay for it out of our own pockets."

After waiting five hours we decided that we would call the Sheriff up again; but he paid no attention, so we got busy breaking everything that we could possibly break. The doctor arrived the next day and ordered the sick man to be taken to a hospital at once. The Sheriff to get even with us brought our conduct to the attention of the Judge who decided that we must be kept on bread and water for three days. But we refused to eat at all during that period.

We were kept in this Chehalis County Jail until December, 1918, when we were moved back to the Immigration station in Seattle where day after day passed under intolerable conditions. Finally "a battleship" was decided upon, after we had made a number of orderly protests of which no notice was taken. We started to break windows, doors, plumbing. A hurry call was sent to the city hall for police, and on their arrival thirteen of us were taken to the city 'can'.

In the Seattle city jail I found a hunger strike was in full force. After thirteen day of it I was taken sick. The doctor came in and said:

"You'd better eat."

I said, "When our demands are granted I will eat and no sooner."

"We have a way to make you fellows eat," he answered.

I said, "Go to it."

So two hours later I was taken to another deportation camp where five men held me while a pump was applied.

"We intend to use this method until you have had enough of it," said the doctor.

"Go to it," I said, "I'll give you a steady job."

On the fifteenth day they were going to do the same thing but something made them change their minds. We were ordered by the Immigration doctor to be moved back to the station, and the doctor resigned his job after fourteen years of service, because he was powerless to do anything for us.

Thus it was one continuous battle from the time of my arrest, until starting for Ellis Island in the famous "Red Special."

After spending seventeen months of my life in the hell-holes of the United States, I was finally released from Ellis Island a few days ago.

"Freedom" in New York City

Jacob Wuasilless of 133 East Seventeenth Street, was eating breakfast in a Third Avenue restaurant yesterday and reading a pamphlet. Detectives Miletski and Orlovsky of Sergt. James E. Gegan's Bomb Squad also were there. Their eyes caught the title—"What is Anarchy?" They followed Wuasilless to his furnished room and, alleging they found a quantity of radical literature, arrested him. Police Headquarters declared that Wuasilless was one of those named in the 3,000 deportation warrants issued about a month ago. He was sent to Ellis Island.—N. Y. Times.

* I. W. W. slang for noisy demonstration accompanied by effort to destroy property.

Excursions in the World of Books

A New Summary of Socialism

BOOKS on Socialism written before the war are mostly out of date in one or more important particulars. The war represented the triumph of a belligerent nationalism which disrupted the old International at the very time it gave new and tragic emphasis to the need for internationalism. It compelled capitalist governments to make ventures in state control of industry which conceded many Socialist arguments for the inadequacy of the old competitive system at the same time that they emphasized the dangers of bureaucracy under either state capitalism or state Socialism. The political revolution in Germany and the social revolution in Russia put Socialists of one school or another to the actual test of exercising authority. Add to these things the growth of the philosophy of syndicalism and of Guild Socialism, the bitter controversy over the proletarian dictatorship, and the split between the Second and Third International, and the need for a text book on modern Socialism will be apparent. Dr. Laidler has met that need with rare fairness in *Socialism in Thought and Action* (Macmillan).

He gives first the general theory of Socialism on which various Socialist and Communist parties would pretty well agree, noting differences of interpretation, however, when they exist. He avails himself of modern statistics and of the facts brought out by the war. The second part of his book deals with the Socialist movement and gives authoritative facts concerning its history both in the period before the war and since. The book is made more valuable by its analytical table of contents, its index, its numerous sub-heads, and its careful references to authorities on matters which the book necessarily has to treat briefly. It is impossible to produce a work of this sort which will not be criticized by partisans of one school or another; but Dr. Laidler has succeeded in his task so well that we have no hesitancy in recommending the book as quite indispensable to those who are just beginning to be interested in Socialism and desire to get a fair view of it. That class ought to be very large, for it is high time the economic illiteracy of America were ended. No intelligent person can afford to be content merely with a newspaper acquaintance with Socialism.

Mr. Lippman on Our Newspapers

MR. WALTER LIPPMAN has written an extremely suggestive little book called *Liberty and the News* (Harcourt, Brace & Howe). His thesis is that it is far more important for men to concern themselves to secure the truth on which opinion is based than to argue the abstract right of freedom of opinion. This thesis he maintains with his accustomed brilliancy and finally sums up his position in these words: "At any rate, our salvation lies in two things: Ultimately, in the infusion of the news-structure by men with a new training and outlook; immediately, in the concentration of the independent forces against the complacency and bad service of the routiniers. We shall advance when we have learned humility; when we have learned to seek the truth, to reveal it and publish it; when we care more for that than for the privilege of arguing about ideas in a fog of uncertainty." In general Mr. Lippman's point is well taken, although it is a bit unfortunate that he feels called upon to take a fling at the effort to preserve the principle—the

abstract principle, if you will—of freedom of opinion. It is difficult indeed to expect men to learn to permit their fellows the right to argue about unpopular ideas; it is not more difficult than to expect them to be capable of recognizing truth and of a willingness to reveal it. But a more serious defect is to be found in what Mr. Lippman fails to discuss. He, like others of the liberal group who often boast of their realism, gives little attention to the reason why our news service is controlled, why truth is distorted. He implies that the trouble is that there are so many special groups which act as "extra-legal organs of government. There is a labor nucleus, a farmers' nucleus, a prohibition nucleus, a National Security League nucleus, and so on. These groups conduct a continual electioneering campaign upon the unformed, exploitable mass of public opinion. Being special groups, they have special sources of information, and what they lack in the way of information is often manufactured." This is true, but to argue that all these groups are equally responsible for the present misrepresentation of facts is absurd. The point is that the gathering of news and its publication is enormously expensive. It can only be engaged in by men who possess large capital. Men who possess large capital consciously or instinctively—and usually quite sincerely—believe that the one great end of life is to maintain the capitalist system. Under these circumstances the news agencies and papers they control exist, with occasional honorable exceptions, to present only what it is desirable that the people should be told from the standpoint of maintaining the capitalist system. The international bankers decide that "capital can have no dealings with Bolshevik Russia." It is not likely therefore that the capitalist newspapers will be intent upon printing the truth about Russia. Illustrations can be multiplied. Mr. Lippman might reply that under any social order it will be necessary to cultivate love of truth for its own sake. Emphatically yes; but it is conceivable that a social order may be established wherein the propagation of lies or half truths is not the most effective means of maintaining the special privileges of a ruling class of imperialistic capitalists, and wherein the discovery of truth will therefore be a less adventurous task. By ignoring this fact, Mr. Lippman has succeeded in writing an essentially Utopian appeal in the name of a realistic rejection of the "classic doctrine of liberty (which) consists of absolutes."

The Brass Check

FROM Mr. Lippman's *Liberty and the News* to Upton Sinclair's *The Brass Check* is a far cry, as far, let us say, as from *The New Republic* to *The Jungle*. Men who praise *Liberty and the News* will be inclined to lay down Upton Sinclair's book with the comment, "Things cannot be as bad as that," or, "Too much Upton Sinclair." Nevertheless, it would be very hard to prove that in any essential respect Mr. Sinclair has misrepresented facts. With singular completeness he has presented documentary evidence of the well-nigh utter prostitution of American journalism. If what he says is not true, he ought to be deluged with suits for libel. The book tempts one to frequent quotation. I refrain because I want to urge readers of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* to get the book and circulate it. It will inspire a holy passion against falsehood, a clear vision of what forces are arrayed against social progress. Mr. Sinclair has a practical suggestion which has been published in *The Nation*. It is the establishment of a national newspaper edited by men of personal integrity and varying viewpoints. The men he

names would (if they could work together) produce a valuable paper. Meanwhile, I wonder if either Mr. Sinclair or Mr. Lippman knows of the Federated Press, a new association of labor and radical papers which is trying to establish its own news service. It has made a very good beginning and deserves general support.

Opium And Empire

OF graver moment to the world than many political questions is the opium peril. By incredible efforts the Chinese succeeded in stamping out the opium traffic originally forced on them by the British in two wars. The governments of the rest of the world gave their nominal aid in this crusade for the salvation of the Chinese race. April 1, 1917, saw the official end of the opium trade in China. But today Japanese, British, and American smugglers, merchants, and manufacturers bear in varying degrees the responsibility for reintroducing the old danger, not now in the form of opium for smoking but in the even more dangerous form of morphia.

The opium monopoly is a source of revenue in India and the various British Asiatic crown colonies. Its sale is increasing in Dutch Java, French Indo-China, and Siam. In 1916-17 the British revenue from opium in India alone was \$118,799,968. The Americans in the Philippines, alone of colonial powers, to the eternal honor of our country, have barred it out. And now the white races too are in danger. In spite of the drastic anti-opium legislation in the United States, it is almost impossible to prevent smuggling along our borders, as frequent newspaper dispatches make clear. There is one way and one way only to end this peril to the future of the whole human race, and that way is to prevent the growing of opium in any save such very small quantities as may be legitimately necessary for medicine. What hinders such social action for the protection of humanity? In effect, nothing but the imperial British government. It still maintains the official opium monopoly in India and still sells at monthly public auction in Calcutta chests of opium to any buyers because there is an enormous profit in it.

There is a singular disposition on the part of good folks not only in England but in the United States to confuse the British Empire with the Kingdom of God, and to believe that it can do no serious wrong in its colonial government. To correct this error is a constructive service. It has become a matter of imperative duty for Americans and the American Government to join with decent Englishmen in demanding the end of British opium production. Any temporary loss of revenue should be borne by Great Britain, not by the Hindu peasant. Perhaps the peril that threatens our own country in this direction may arouse us who have so long been indifferent when the victims of the heinous traffic were Asiatics.

If this paragraph seems exaggerated to some of our readers, we beg them to read without delay Ellen La Motte's little book *The Opium Monopoly* (Macmillan), which gives statistics drawn from official sources to back up the charges we have made. The hideous massacre of Amritsar aroused widespread indignation, but here is a record of an even more deadly sin of the British government in Asia. It is a sin which we have a right to expect the England of the rising forces of Labor to end.

N. T.

Karsner's Life of Debs

KARSNER'S life of Debs, (*Debs—His Authorized Life and Letters*. Boni & Liveright) should be widely read, if one may be permitted the quibble: is likely to be, by partisans and friends of Debs; ought to be, by stodgy folk who know of him only that he several times ran for president on the Socialist ticket. The latter will learn, for instance, that he first made his mark as labor organizer in the Great Northern Railroad affair in the early '90's; was caught in the toils during the infamous Pullman strike of 1894; and from Woodstock Prison, to which he was sentenced to six months for contempt of court, emerged a Socialist, where before he had been simply an organizer of labor, voting the Democratic ticket. Already they will have heard of Debs' trial and conviction, in 1918, under the wartime Espionage Law: for oddly enough, the author sees fit to make the climax of Debs' career the head and front of the account, instead of letting his career culminate in the climax.

Yet such inversion was scarcely necessary: the reader who would not in wrath throw down unfinished Debs' speech before the court which sentenced him would need no cart before to keep the nag attention on the trot. For the book, whatever its short-comings, reads itself. It is almost inconceivable one should dismiss it with a yawn. Rather, it makes interest sit bolt upright. A quick, vivid, easy journalistic style sees to that—helped out by rapidity of movement, seldom hampered by irrelevant dwelling upon details, and by frequent—very frequent—quotation from the ringing language of Debs himself, his speeches and letters.

We suspect, however, that the character of Debs is here somewhat sentimentalized. He appears as a highly emotional but not a high-strung man; a lover of family and of little children; a true proletarian, practicing with scrupulous zeal the theory of brotherhood; generous, in goods and affection, toward all men; modest, easily approached yet not lacking in dignity; of natural oratorical eloquence not unseasoned with poetic imagination; an infinitely patient, tolerant, kindly man, hating the sin but not the sinner; disarming, by his candor and his kindness, even his enemies; a man burning with zeal for the cause he had espoused—at white heat, yet never consumed; a little of the fanatic, much of the saint; an enthusiast and a crusader if there ever was one. In short, a simple man, completely absorbed in his mission, unselfish, toward whom all hearts of generous impulse go out instinctively, in perfect confidence and trust.

Thus Karsner, who, being an intimate friend of Debs, is more likely than not to see his fine qualities; and being somewhat of a propagandist interested in writing an appreciation rather than an estimate, is hardly to be blamed for minimizing faults. But sentimentalized or not, definite Debs is, at all events. One comes to know the man, to feel he has associated personally with him, in his private life and his public. One may not agree with his political notions. One may fear or hate with all one's mind and heart and strength the new order which Debs as Socialist yearns to bring to the world. But few, one hopes, would gloat over the fate of this man of sixty-four, penned up in Atlanta prison, crowded in with five other prisoners, his life work apparently over. W. L. U.

The Last Page

FROM ENGLAND COMES A PRACTICAL SUGGESTION which I should like to pass on to the National Security League, the National Board of Fire Underwriters, and other patriotic organizations which are now directing against what they call "the menace of the Red peril" those unquenchable floods of patriotic oratory with which during the war they fought so valiantly on behalf of justice, liberty, freedom, and all the other fine words in the dictionary. It appears that the English Security League (for there are such people in all lands) has lately addressed a stirring appeal to the ministers of all the churches asking for aid in the fight against "Bolshevism." This appeal is accompanied by a typewritten copy of a suggested sermon by means of which the minister may bring home to his congregation the present perilous position of civilization. A correspondent of mine who received one of these appeals tells me that he promptly returned the sermon ("blasphemous nonsense" he calls it) with a note containing only these words: "Dear Sir, Jesus I know and Paul I know, but who are ye?"

IN 1920 THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS REFUSES TO seat Mr. Berger because he is a Socialist; forty years ago, in 1880, the British House of Commons refused to admit Charles Bradlaugh because he was an atheist (though he had done no more to deserve that name than to claim the right to affirm instead of taking the oath in the usual way). Those British law-makers behaved very much as our own are now doing. Every kind of abuse was heaped upon Mr. Bradlaugh's head. One distinguished M. P. argued that "the man who does not fear God cannot honor the King." Another said that "honor and conscience are words that should not be used with reference to an infidel." Mr. Bradlaugh, however, was more fortunate than Mr. Berger in that he had several stout defenders in Parliament including Mr. Gladstone, John Bright, and Mr. Parnell. Mr. Bradlaugh's case was taken to the courts, where a decision was given against him. His seat was declared vacant, but the electors of Northampton, like those of Milwaukee, promptly re-elected their man with an increased majority. When Mr. Bradlaugh attempted to take his seat in the House following his re-election the Mother of Parliaments so far forgot herself as to shout and curse and fight like a drunken fishwife. In a free-for-all fight Mr. Bradlaugh's clothes were torn off his back, and although a man of unusual strength he was overcome by his adversaries and rendered unconscious in the mêlée. Shortly after this edifying spectacle Parliament was dissolved and "the bellowing blasphemer of Northampton," as Mr. Bradlaugh was called by an eminent clergyman, was elected for a third time and under the new Government was permitted to take his seat. I wonder what adventures are waiting for Mr. Berger.

WHEN MR. HORACE V. WINCHELL, THE RETIRING President of the American Institute of Engineers, introduced Mr. Hoover at a recent meeting of the Institute in New York, he was interrupted with a burst of applause when he said, "Permit me to introduce our next President." When the cheering had subsided, Mr. Winchell caused much laughter, says the New York Times, "by the anti-climactic remark,—of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers."

That word 'anti-climactic' sets me wondering. When I think of what our engineers have done,—these men of vision, action, and achievement,—mingling the oceans through their great canals, spanning rivers and deep ravines with their mighty bridges, building their iron roads like a net over all the world, and then consider to what a pass of destruction and ruin our statesmen have brought us, I begin to doubt whether those concluding words of Mr. Winchell's introduction are so very much of an anti-climax after all. Who would not rather have made the Panama Canal or built the Brooklyn Bridge than have the Peace Treaty of Versailles to his credit?

I WONDER THAT NOBODY HAS WORKED OUT THE connection between red tape and revolution. For my part I believe that the father of the Bolshevik is the bureaucrat, and that the advancing Red armies are the avenging sword that will cut the Gordian knot of red tape in which we are all entangled. From personal experience I know that one ill-mannered jackanapes in a passport office (and I have met only one instance of the other kind) can create in a day more enthusiastic followers of Lenin and Trotsky than *The Atlantic Monthly* could pacify in six months, or the redoubtable *Review* could cure in a year. In the ante-rooms of Government buildings in Washington, and in half the capitals of Europe, I have rubbed shoulders and cooled heels with scores of respectable citizens whose views on official manners and official methods, if freely and accurately expressed, would entitle them, under our new Sterling Sedition Bill, to a short, sharp trial and a sunrise ceremony with a stone wall for a background.

In England, I'm told, they are developing one of the most perfect bureaucracies in Europe, and therefore the most stupid. For instance, a friend of mine living near London tells me of a recent experience with the Department of Agriculture. In many parts of England just now there is quite a serious plague of rats. My friend found that he was entertaining several of these unwelcome visitors, so in response to an official announcement offering advice on the subject, he wrote to the Department for help. Here is his diary showing the progress of events:

- (1) Wrote to the Board of Agriculture.
- (2) Received a formal acknowledgment.
- (3) Was rung up on the 'phone and asked to communicate with the County Council.
- (4) Wrote to the County Council.
- (5) Received a formal acknowledgment.
- (6) Advised to write to the official rat-catcher for the county.
- (7) Wrote to the rat-catcher.
- (8) Wrote to the County Council saying nothing had been heard from the rat-catcher, though several weeks had elapsed.
- (9) Received a letter from the County Council saying the matter had been referred to a sub-committee.
- (10) Hearing nothing from the sub-committee, wrote to the County Council again.
- (11) Five weeks have passed and not even a formal acknowledgment has arrived.
- (12) Rats—including several mothers and sons—doing well.

Send postcard for free copy of

THE CITY OF GOD

Being Chapter XV from
BOUCK WHITE'S

THE FREE CITY

A BOOK OF NEIGHBORHOOD

Moffat, Yard & Co., Publishers

31 Union Square

New York City

Just Published

The Truth About the Lusk Committee

A Report of the Legislative Committee of
the People's Freedom Union

PUBLISHED BY THE NATION PRESS, NEW YORK

In Pamphlet Form, 25 cents

Order copies through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK
DEPARTMENT.

THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT was started last month with two objects: to serve our readers and to help support THE WORLD TOMORROW. We are now prepared to supply you with any book in which you may be interested, from detective stories to economics, from politics to religion. Tell us what you want and enclose the price of the book plus 8% for postage west of Chicago, 5% east; or ask us to send it by express collect.

If you are not sure of the price, or want other information, write us. We are here to serve you.

And remember what we said last month: the purchase of only one book a year from us by each of our readers will help us by about \$4,000. However, don't limit yourself to one book. We are frank to say that we need all the funds we can get.

The Church League FOR

Industrial Democracy

PREAMBLE:

We face a world in revolution. Some regret the fact; some thank God for it. Regret and gratitude are in a sense equally irrelevant; the Church is called to act, and the contemporary situation furnishes her with a challenge and an opportunity unsurpassed since Pentecost.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this organization is to unite, for intercession and labor, those within the Episcopal Church who believe that it is an essential part of the Church's function to make justice and love the controlling motives in all social change, and who wish, as Christians, to promote all sound movements looking toward the democratization of industry and the socialization of life.

We affirm our belief that only that social order can properly be called Christian which substitutes fraternal co-operation for mastership in industry and life.

President:

RT. REV.
CHAR. D. WILLIAMS, D. D.
Bishop of Michigan

Chairman Executive
Committee:

MISS VERA D. RUTHER
Wellesley College

For information and literature address:

REV. RICHARD W. HOOVER, Exec. Secy.
851 Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md.

WEARING APPAREL AND MONEY TO BUY FOOD TO BE SENT TO THE STARVING PEOPLE OF GERMANY

MAY BE FORWARDED TO

MISS ADELE SCHMACHTENBERG
52 RUTLAND ROAD, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

EXPERIENCED TEACHER in modern languages and music, a Friend, willing to help with light house-keeping duties, desires position in family in or near New York City.

M. T., care of THE WORLD TOMORROW.

SOCIALISM IN THOUGHT AND ACTION

By HARRY W. LAIDLER

Secretary, Intercollegiate Socialist Society

The most up-to-date statement of the aims and methods of Socialism, including what it is doing and what it has done in Europe and America.

\$2.50 net. Postpaid, \$2.70. Excess postage if any will be returned.

Order through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK
DEPARTMENT.

"We Have Never Fought Women and Children"

Herbert Hoover

The American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, representing the Quakers of America, has assumed entire responsibility of feeding the undernourished children of Germany, in addition to their general relief work in France, Serbia, Vienna, Poland and the Baltic provinces.

APPEAL FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

The Friends are working in close co-operation with the European Children's Fund, which is giving one supplementary meal each day to nearly 3,000,000 children in nine countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The Quakers will follow the same methods in Germany. An extra meal is given daily to those children who are shown, by medical examination, to require additional food. The work is carried on without distinction of a religious or a political character.

"Gravest Food Crisis Will Be in April and May"

(Cable from Friends Unit)

There are today 10,000,000 undernourished children in Germany. A single meal costs 5 cents. To feed 1,000,000 children six months, January to June, until the next harvest, will cost \$9,000,000.

Special work planned for children's hospitals and children's homes will require an additional \$3,000,000.

The Friends pay for personnel, office and overhead expenses. The European Children's Fund, of which Herbert Hoover is Chairman, provides out of a special fund all expenses of transportation.

Every dollar given in America means a dollar's worth of food to the German child.

American Quakers are supervising the distribution of this food.

Help Bind Up the Wounds of War

America Cannot Let Little Children Starve

Send your contributions at once and make checks payable to

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

RUFUS M. JONES, Chairman; WILBUR K. THOMAS, Exec. Secretary; CHARLES F. JENKINS, Treasurer

20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Approved by the National Information Bureau, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

This advertisement is paid for by a Cooperator of THE WORLD TOMORROW in the hope that the readers of the magazine will not only contribute themselves, but will help to arouse their communities, especially the ministers and the churches, the editors and other leaders of public opinion, to the importance of this opportunity—one of the greatest which has ever come to the people of America.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 5

MAY, 1920

10 Cents

The Strike

A Discussion

- I. The Strike an Unethical Means of Coercion—by Henry J. Cadbury
- II. The Strike a Justifiable Method of Passive Resistance—by Norman Thomas.

Is Our Navy Responsible for Corrupting Youth?
by a Y. M. C. A. Secretary in China

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the May Issue

	PAGE
The Strike: I. The Strike an Un- ethical Means of Coercion, by HENRY J. CADBURY.....	131
II. The Strike a Justifiable Form of Passive Resistance, by NORMAN THOMAS.....	133
Signs of the Times.....	135
Oulja—Summon Thomas Jefferson!	139
Is Our Navy Responsible for Cor- rupting Youth? by a Y. M. C. A. Secretary in China.....	140
A Red Wedge in the Brotherhoods?	141
The Christ of the Bolsheviks—trans- lated from the Russian.....	142
Mr. Gompers and the Labor Party, by JAMES C. HICKET.....	143
The Pew vs. the Pillow, by WILLIAM E. BORN.....	145
On Journalism, by H. L. MENCEN.....	148
The Two Internationals, by ALBERT D. BALDAN.....	151
Open for Discussion.....	154
Ex Libris.....	156
The Last Page.....	159

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. May, 1920. No. 5

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publish-
ers, 118 East 28th St., New York.
Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L.
Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer;
John Nevins Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD
TOMORROW: Norman Thomas,
Editor; Gove Hambridge, Assistant
Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin,
Edward W. Evans, Walter G.
Fuller, John Haynes Holmes,
Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown
Leach, John Howard Melish,
Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence,
Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F.
Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is
published on the first of the month,
price ten cents a copy; annual sub-
scription in the United States \$1.00;
Canada \$1.15; other countries of the
Postal Union, \$1.25. Orders for
copies, subscriptions, and all cor-
respondence should be sent to THE
WORLD TOMORROW at The
Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th
Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter
March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of
New York, N. Y., under the Act of
March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

HENRY J. CADBURY is Lecturer on the New Testament in Andover Theologi-
cal Seminary, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

RALPH B. COLSON is a Y. M. C. A. Secretary in Hankow, China.

JAMES C. HICKET is connected with the New York Sun.

WILLIAM E. BORN is well known as a Chautauque lecturer and writer.

REV. ALBERT D. BALDAN is a Congregational clergyman who has con-
tributed to various magazines in England and America, and who
is especially concerned with the problem of applied Christianity.

Keep your religious thinking abreast of your other thinking!

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

A Journal of Religion

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON and HERBERT L. WILLETT,
Editors.

IN THESE days of great thinking on world themes, construc-
tive leaders must think greatly on Christian themes. A
notable series of brilliant and candid articles by leading
American thinkers, covering the entire range of typical present-
day opinion from orthodox apologetic to radical criticism, is now
appearing in THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY, on the general subject—

“Will the Church Survive?”

The most significant journalistic offering in the history of the
American religious press. Among the writers are:

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, Dr. Robert E. Speer, Mr. John Spargo,
Dr. Joseph Ernest McAfee, Mr. Francis Hackett, the Hon. Louis
F. Post, Dr. Graham Taylor, Prof. Harry F. Ward, Dr. Shailer
Mathews, Dr. Burris Jenkins, Dr. Edward Scribner Ames, Bishop
Francis J. McConnell, Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie, Mr. Max
Eastman, Mr. Carl Sandburg, Dr. H. D. C. MacLachlan and
others.

The Subscription Price of THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY is Three
Dollars a Year. New Subscribers note two special acquaintance
offers in coupons below.

—Tear off and mail today—

Acquaintance Subscription to Jan.
1, 1921, \$2.

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
720 E. 40th St., Chicago.
For the enclosed \$2 please send
me THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
weekly, until Jan. 1, 1921, and a
copy of “The Protestant,” by
Burris Jenkins.

Name

Address

Five Months' Acquaintance Sub-
scription, \$1.

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
720 E. 40th St., Chicago.

For the enclosed \$1 please send
me THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY for a
trial period of 5 months (22 issues).

Name

Address

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 5

MAY, 1920

10 Cents

The Strike

AT the request of several of our readers we are opening in this issue a discussion of the ethics of the strike. From many quarters strikes are under fire. Economists denounce them as wasteful, and defenders of the status quo blame them for the high cost of living. Politicians fear them as "revolutionary." Statesmen argue that whereas it is legitimate to strike for more wages, a strike for ends commonly called political—as, for example, to prevent intervention in Mexico—would be subversive of "democracy." But for a small group of Americans there is an even more fundamental question. They opposed war. Can they now consistently support strikes? Some of these people find that their friends who supported war gladly assume that pacifists will oppose strikes. The question whether strikes are ethical is therefore a critical question in many minds. We welcome correspondence on it, and indeed upon all other aspects of the strike problem.

In the discussion that follows it should be understood (1) that to support the right to strike is not to approve of the wisdom or justice of every strike, and (2) that to oppose strikes as unethical is not to argue that it is ethical to try to prevent them by legal coercion.

I. The Strike an Unethical Means of Coercion

DEAR FELLOW RECONCILER:

I WANT to write briefly to explain better than I could do in our unfinished conversation the other day what I meant by my comparison of strikes and war. I write the more confidently because I am assured by our similar experiences as pacifists through the war of a precious fellowship which binds us together, and because I was convinced that your position during those trying years was due to your conviction that you were not justified in compromising or falling short of the more excellent way. If your objection to war had been of a purely socialistic or class-conscious type, if you had relied mainly on the futility or waste of war, if you had been moved chiefly by sentimental or humanitarian motives, I should not have presented my argument as I did. It was because you ac-

cepted the absolute position of a conscientious objector on the highest religious and ethical grounds that I asked you to consider the strike in the same light.

You will not suppose, I hope, that my objection to the strike is solely that, according to the capitalist press, it connotes violence and bloodshed. I am not deceived by this propaganda for "law and order." I acknowledge with deep respect the consistent and heroic efforts made by labor to eliminate the use of force from their industrial quarrels, and I realize that where violence has been used in recent strikes it either has been employed by the capitalists or their agents or has been the result of a systematic teasing and tempting of the strikers by those who wished to discredit them. And anyhow, even in the case of war it was not the doctrinaire objection to physical force that made you and me to be pacifists. It was our conviction that compulsion was not God's way nor the method he wished men to use—not coercion but conversion, as you yourself used to put it. Certainly the strike, however bloodless, is to a large extent a method of coercion.

Nor will you suppose that in condemning strikes I am indifferent to the injustices which provoke them. I am aware of the crucial difficulties of labor and of the anguish and loss of life each month's delay means. Just as your own neutrality in the war, adopted for the sincerest moral reasons, seemed to your compatriots pure pro-Germanism, so my disapproval of the strike will, quite as unjustly, be called pro-capital. But to be understood of men is not one of the beatitudes of the Christian life. The labor sympathizers are in danger of falling into the same casuistry as did the pro-war liberals. They were so absorbed in the relative superiority of the cause for which America was fighting, so convinced of the justice and unselfishness of our participation, that what seemed to us the previous moral question—whether the way of war was justified—was completely swallowed up in their intense conviction that the end was good; and for them the end justified the means. In the same way we have come into sympathetic touch with labor; we see the desperate straits in which it is placed, and we believe passionately in its cause. You will pardon me for saying that the upshot of

your argument the other day seemed to be that in a desperate labor situation fastidiousness about ways and means was ill-timed.

In the position I hold in condemning strikes, I will seem to you as blind to the commendable elements in the strike as to its praiseworthy ends. The educational value of a strike, its public drawing of the issues, its opportunity for advertising, are all urged; and on the moral side, the splendid sense of brotherhood among the workers, their heroic self-sacrifice, and in the case of a sympathetic strike, their disinterested altruism. But all the similar by-products of war, though you could not help acknowledging them to some extent, did not move you. You saw the same brotherhood, idealism, and self-sacrifice in the war, and yet condemned it.

The typical criticism directed against the pacifist was that he ignored a crisis in the lives of men and sat passively by while others made at least an effort, even if erroneously, to minister to human needs. Such a criticism will be made of me if I condemn the obvious method of quick relief by the strike. Yet passivity and indifference are not necessary to such condemnation, as your experience in the war will tell you. The labor situation is critical and we must act; we must invent and apply new and unheard-of remedies, if necessary, to a phase in industry fast becoming crucial; my only plea is that in acting we choose our method and test it as carefully as we do our ends. Even if at the moment no guaranteed method suggests itself, it is better to avoid one known to be evil; and an inventive and inquiring spirit cannot long fail to find a solution. Your question, What else can the worker do? echoes the very words of the pro-war liberals in the recent conflict, as I need not remind you. And you cannot insist that I answer that question. Our position on war as expressed recently in *THE WORLD TOMORROW* applies to the industrial situation as well: "We believe that the difficulty of pointing to an immediate and obviously practical method of securing a given end does not justify us in approving a method which is in itself morally indefensible."

It must be admitted that the analogy of the strike and war is imperfect. For while we may agree that both are forms of coercion, their method, you insisted, is different. The striker does not seek to kill his employer in cold blood, but at most to decrease the employer's exorbitant profits; while the warrior's aim is the destruction of life as well as of revenue. And further, you urged that the warrior's act is positive, while the striker in refusing to work is merely declining to be made a slave. His act is purely negative, and surely he has a right to refuse to work if he sees fit. It is merely an act of gentlemanly refusal. In reply, let me answer the two points you made. It is true that the immediate purpose of war is to kill enemy soldiers, but its ultimate purpose is to exert such pressure that the opposing government will concede what

is demanded, whether the demand is just or unjust. The killing is merely secondary. And secondly, as to the negative character of the strike compared with the positive act of killing, that is certainly a popular distinction between right and wrong; but it is not always valid by the more thorough-going standards of ethics. There are sins of omission as well as of commission. Your experience with the conscientious objectors must have made you realize that for vice or virtue the standards of positive and negative form the most superficial of moral tests.

A better analogy, it seems to me, is that between the economic blockade and the strike. The blockades of Germany and Russia are examples of what the economic weapon means. I have heard you speak in more severe condemnation of these measures than you ever used against war. And yet the blockade is more like the strike than like war. Certainly it is like the strike in the two particulars in which you contrast the strike with war. The aim of the blockade is likewise merely economic pressure. It is true that it has in these two cases led to appalling loss of life, but its primary purpose was to decrease the revenue of foreign merchants and to enlist civilian interest against the policy of the government. Again, the method of the blockade was purely negative. It was a refusal to make machinery or clothes for a given group of persons, or to sell them food. Surely the American farmer and manufacturer have as much right not to work for the Kaiser or Lenin as the striker has not to work for Judge Gary. And yet the negative character of the blockade does not make it more ethical than war.

It is true that our attitude to the blockade has changed in recent years. There was a time, in 1915, when our consciences, then insensitive, approved of the method of non-intercourse as a substitute for war. The change is partly due to the fact that you and I have not sympathized with the purpose of the Allies in their use of this weapon, and partly because its scale has become enlarged and its disastrous possibilities known. It may be that our attitude toward strikes can be changed only by similar developments—by the use of a strike in a manifestly unjust cause, or by its extension beyond all previous experience. You will grant that we have not yet seen the possibilities of the industrial strike, just as we had not seen the possibilities of the international boycott in 1915. But sooner than we expect, perhaps in a few years or a few months, it may reveal its hideous and murderous power upon innocent men, women, and children. Given a situation where the key industries unite in a cause which they feel overwhelmingly to be just and Christian; given that ruthless steeling of the heart against the cries of the innocent sufferer, in loyalty to a good cause, which was present on both sides of the recent conflict; and you have a condition of human anguish unparalleled in the history of the

world. It is a commonplace that the threatened strike of the Triple Alliance in Great Britain could have done more injury to the general public on that Island in a few weeks than did eighteen months of Germany's submarine warfare.

There is much more that might be said—much even on the practical side, as to the inefficiency and self-defeating qualities of strikes. But I must not debate with you on a plane which you yourself declined to consider during the war. The history of Quakerism has convinced me of the great im-

portance there is for at least a small group of people—peculiar they may seem—to be peculiar in this, that their consciences are so enlightened that they today recognize as evil what all consciences a century later will universally condemn. And for you and me, is not the duty as plain today as it was two or three years ago to call evil by its right name, to keep unconfused the ends and the means, and by word and character to preach the more excellent way even "in a world which does not yet accept it"?
HENRY J. CADBURY.

The Strike

II. The Strike a Justifiable Form of Passive Resistance

DEAR HENRY CADBURY:

YOUR letter tempts me to try to answer it even if I do not fit the picture of the particular fellow reconciler you so skillfully draw. I shall assume that however we may differ we both stand for the glorious ideal of a world of freedom and fellowship. How shall we attain it? We are living—a hundred and ten million of us in America alone—bound together in an economic structure which rests on the compulsion to which you object. The clothes we wear and the food we eat are produced by the exploitation of our fellows. You will agree that no ethical dereliction can be greater than to be passive in the face of the wrong of our time. We must do something. It is against this background of inescapable duty that I ask you to examine war, the blockade, and the strike.

I am opposed to war (1) because war is a deadly enemy of that respect for human personality which is the very foundation-stone of any worthy or even tolerable civilization. As a soldier I surrender my will and conscience into the hands of others who use me as a tool in the destruction of my fellowmen whom I have never seen, against whom I have no personal grievance. It is mine "not to reason why, mine but to do or die," and "to do" in this case means nothing in the world but the attempt to kill without mercy and without compassion as many of my fellow beings as possible.

(2) I am opposed to war because it is a tragically wasteful and self-defeating method of securing any desirable result. I do not say that no liberation has ever followed war. I do say that it has been secured at a terrible cost and that modern warfare has enormously increased that cost. The frustration of the hopes of all the idealists who perished in this conflict is of course due in large part to the nature of the capitalistic imperialism out of which grew both the terror of the War and the iniquity of the Peace. But surely it is also true that the nature of war itself is incompatible with the sense of universal comradeship and the power of sober thought which are essential to the fulfilment of the dreams of those who fought

in the faith that by fighting they could forever end war. It is possible to compile statistics of material losses and a census of the slain; it is never possible to record the real cost to humanity of such a struggle as we have survived.

I must confess that I am growing more and more afraid of "absolutes" in ethics or human conduct; but this I do affirm: there are some courses of human conduct so opposed to the dictates of my conscience that I cannot engage in them and be myself. Of these war is chief. Moreover, I am persuaded that there is a moral government of the universe which makes it impossible that we shall ever win the Kingdom of Heaven on this earth by the essentially immoral method of war. Humanity must discover some other way than war of overcoming evil if ever we are to be saved.

So much for war. What of the strike? The former is a concerted effort to kill; the latter a concerted laying down of tools. Surely the difference is enormous. I grant that coercive tactics are to be found in most strikes, but never is there such a violation of personality as there necessarily is in war. You admit some of the valuable by-products of strikes. They are perhaps greater than you realize. The strike is often a time of genuine education for the workers along many different lines, including social morality. There is a continual appeal in the better ordered strikes to avoid violence and to trust to the power of solidarity. I shall not say that there are no strikes in which the strikers sometimes see red (usually after provocation from the opposite camp), but I shall affirm that whereas it is the business of the military leader to make the soldier see red before the bayonet charge, it is the business of the strike leader to make strikers keep their heads and not see red.

Nor is the strike tragically wasteful to the degree that war has been. It is, I think, a matter of sober history that labor organization, which necessarily employs the strike or threat of the strike as its weapon, has been the most powerful means for lifting labor above the brutal wage slavery of the early periods of the industrial revolution. If

women no longer draw coal cars in mines, if children no longer go to work at six and seven years of age, if labor is no longer regarded primarily as a commodity, the reason is to be found not chiefly in humanitarianism and in the advance of moral standards, but in the organization of labor and in the knowledge that labor could and would use the strike. And against this credit account there are not the ghastly debits that war, for the loftiest cause, always amasses. The worst strikes have never brought such suffering, deterioration of the racial stock, perversion of ideals, destruction of homes, as war in any cause always brings. In short, the difference between war and strikes is so enormous that it has always seemed to me that an analogy between them is only possible on the plane of an academic and metaphysical ethics quite divorced from the realities of life.

You yourself seem to admit this in part by suggesting that your real analogy is not with war but with the blockade. I grant that your second analogy is the stronger, but not that it is conclusive. Again I beg you to look at realities and not at possibilities. When the Allies starved Germany or Russia, they were acting against a distant enemy. They themselves suffered no direct consequences of that blockade and could allow no mitigations of its cruelties in behalf of women and children. But whenever there is a general strike or a strike in an essential industry, the workers themselves are usually the first to suffer. When coal is not mined the children of the miners go cold and hungry at least as soon as any others in the community. The strikers who are blockading the community suffer with the community, and there is no reason to believe that they can or will ever press that point of suffering to the degree that follows the blockade of a beleaguered country by a foreign foe. But this is not all, nor even the chief point of difference. The whole tendency in modern strikes is for the strikers themselves to provide for the conduct of those economic and political functions necessary for the life of the community. In Winnipeg and Seattle active and on the whole successful organizations were set up by the strikers to keep not only their own families but the community from disease and starvation. It may be that such organizations will not be wholly successful. It is theoretically possible, as you say, that a strike of the Triple Alliance could do more injury to England than did Germany's submarine warfare. Practically, however, if the strike of the Triple Alliance were to be successful the strikers themselves would have to look out for hospitals, for the sick and for the weak in the community by some device or other. If they failed in this, their power would soon pass from them. In any event, your argument proves, not that men ought never to strike, but that to carry some strikes beyond a certain point is a crime against the community.

But the great weakness of your position is your

failure to present an alternative. In the complexities of modern life there are times when it may be necessary for the individual to fall back on some such simple declaration as you quote from *THE WORLD TOMORROW*: "The difficulty of pointing to an immediate and obviously practical method of securing a given end does not justify us in approving a method which is in itself morally indefensible." But I confess that if I were to rewrite that sentence (whose authorship I acknowledge), I should want to add that it is only in the clearest cases of moral obliquity that one can take this position of refusal to engage in a method regardless of the consequences. When I opposed war it was partly in the conviction that a general strike or an extension of the method that the conscientious objectors used might as a last resort be a far more effective method against the invader than war. Bertrand Russell, you will remember, has elaborated this argument with great cogency. In refusing to take part in the war, the conscientious objector could give a forcible answer to those who charged him with virtual alliance with the enemy. He could say: "Let the enemy come, and if persuasion fails, we can meet him by an intensified degree of the opposition I now offer you. Unitedly we can block him at every point by steadfast refusal to obey his commands. He may kill us; he cannot break our wills; and sooner or later his soldiers will recoil with horror from their task. Meanwhile the very knowledge that some of us refuse to fight may awaken a like spirit on the part of the enemy's soldiers and promote that revulsion against the whole business of war which will bring liberation to mankind."

No such alternative is open to you in your wholesale condemnation of the strike. Inevitably you are playing into the hands of the industrial autocrat and exploiter. Suppose I as a worker adopt your position. My fellow workers decide to go out on strike as a last resort to protest against intolerable conditions, which affect not only them and their children, but directly or indirectly the whole laboring class. I may say: "Comrades I do not believe the strike is moral and do not wish to take part in this conflict, though I sympathize with your grievances." But what can I do? If I lay down my tools, even though I do not cooperate with the other strikers, I am a part of the strike. If I go back to work, I am a scab and I am supporting actively the wrong side in this industrial conflict! There is no way of escape. I am inevitably a partner on one side or the other.

Perhaps at this point you will quote Tolstoy to me and say that he supported neither strikes nor the coercive powers of capitalism. True; but Tolstoy was consistent as most of you who oppose strikes are not. He said the whole system of modern industry was wrong; that humanity ought to return to a more primitive form of society in which each man did bread labor. He tried to act

on this individualistic doctrine. You have not even suggested it. As long as you are content to enjoy the advantages of modern machine production, you are bound to suggest a way to those who are exploited by it to secure redress of wrong. You say, do not strike; but you fail to realize that in so saying you are buttressing the power of a political and economic system which rests upon coercion. You are the ally of a social order which uses its power over the individual more ruthlessly than any body of strikers. Can you not see that our whole system of profit, rent, and interest rests upon physical, moral, and spiritual coercion, that the state itself is largely an organization for the protection not of freedom but of private property? Under these circumstances, what is left to the workers? Political action, perhaps? I believe in the value of political action, but its pitfalls are many and its ethics from the absolute standard you have chosen to adopt are more dubious than the ethics of strikes themselves. I favor any adjustment which will at once promote freedom and make strikes unnecessary, but I am obliged to admit that there is a wide field in which political action is slow, tortuous, bureaucratic. The workers would have made poor progress if they had used or attempted to use only political action instead of appealing primarily to industrial organization. But perhaps I am not fair in assuming your advocacy of political action. You may share Tolstoy's objection to the state and its machinery just as you share his non-resistant philosophy. For the present I am only concerned to argue that, however beautiful in spirit is your objection to the strike, you are delivering us who were pacifists during the war into the hands of the economic

imperialists who made the war. I am deeply concerned that opposition to war should be made a living and vital force in the community. It can never be done if we are to go to the extreme of opposing even such passive resistance as is typified by the strike. If our position means that we have nothing but persuasion (and I do not despise persuasion) wherewith to oppose the sinister forces of capitalistic imperialism which steadily drag us toward a catastrophe more appalling than that we have barely escaped, I do not think we will bring any blessing to mankind. A few of us happen to be free from personal and direct participation in the class struggle. Our ethical speculations on the evil of every form of force may be beautiful, but have they not the parasitical beauty of the orchid which lives at the expense of the tree from which it hangs? If such complete non-resistance as you suggest is to escape the condemnation of a passivism which plays whether you will or no into the hands of the oppressor, there is but one way of escape. It is the way which Tolstoy tried to follow. Let us turn our backs on machinery and science and feed ourselves by bread labor. Profoundly as I respect Tolstoy, I cannot feel that his way will solve the problem. Machine production and the consequent organization of labor with all their faults and perils are enormously serviceable to mankind; therefore I am compelled to take the side of labor in the struggle against their exploiters not in the interest of a class but of mankind; and until you can suggest a better weapon of passive resistance than the strike, I cannot join you in condemning it.

NORMAN THOMAS.

Signs of the Times

America's Answer to the Versailles Peace

ONCE more the Senate has killed the treaty. This time it seems likely that it will stay dead: yet there are at least a dozen things which worry the Man-in-the-Street more than the fate of the peace which once we had looked to as the dawn of a new reign of good will on earth. Mr. Wilson himself is largely responsible for the death of his own child. Had he handled the treaty with more skill and consented months ago to some reservations, it is probable that he might have secured ratification. As it was, his refusal to compromise gave time to the opposition to strengthen itself. He played into the hands of the valiant Senatorial Irreconcilables. Old-fashioned Americanism, political partisanship, friendship for Ireland, suspicion of Britain—all these were factors in the final refusal of the Senate to endorse Mr. Wilson's peace. But the biggest factor of all was the manifest failure of the treaty to bring peace in Europe. A newspaper cartoon represents England, France, and Italy all stewing together in a boiling caldron marked

"European politics." They call out to Uncle Sam, "Come on in, the water's fine,"—but Uncle Sam stays outside. Mr. Man-in-the-Street is inclined to think Uncle Sam's judgment sound. He might have favored the treaty with sufficiently stringent reservations; he certainly favors no treaty which will involve America in the enforcement of the terms of the peace of Versailles.

No Peace Without Internationalism

FRANK SIMONDS, who is no radical, has done a service by pointing out the difficulty of making an idealistic peace on a nationalistic basis. There has been too much criticism of President Wilson for his personal failure at the peace conference and not a clear enough realization that the way he tried with the approval of American liberals and some American radicals was essentially impossible. Given the present theories of the political state, the doctrine of exclusive nationalism with its tariffs and strategic frontiers, there were only two possibilities in making and enforcing the peace:

(1) that the United States should constitute itself a sort of God to judge between the nations, trying to weigh in even scales the rival pretensions of this nation and that, and ending by winning the real favor of none and saddling itself with enormous responsibilities; (2) that the United States should make an alliance with other strong powers to enforce a compromise peace. Such a compromise would be far from ideal or permanent. For instance, we might unite with Great Britain as against France in regard to the treatment of Germany; but we would have to remember that Britain has not yet proposed to give back any of the gains she herself made in the treaty and that her policy in the Near East is as imperialistic as is that of her rival. The truth of the matter is there is one way and only one way to secure peace, and that is to promote the spirit of true internationalism. Internationalism is not opposed to the right sort of nationalism, but it is opposed to imperialism, political and economic. It is opposed to the supremacy of the profit motive and the philosophy of the political state, which must be banished from our social life before ever we can attain a federation of free peoples.

Obit.—Democracy

ON April 1st by an overwhelming vote all five of the Socialist Assemblymen were finally expelled from the New York Legislature. The result was a foregone conclusion since it was evident that Speaker Sweet controlled the bi-partisan machine. He has accomplished what the Czars and Kaisers dared not do. There is no Parliament in Europe today which does not contain Socialists who are avowed revolutionaries. The particular charges on which the Socialist Assemblymen were expelled affected not their personal character but the party as a whole. They were the sort of arguments which the enemies of Socialism might legitimately urge on the stump against the election of Socialists—although even on the soap-box one would desire a greater regard for the verities than was displayed by the State. They were not the sort of arguments that could be used for depriving the people of their franchise and taxing them without representation. As a matter of fact, the merits or demerits of the Socialist platform are utterly irrelevant in this connection. It is the function of true representative government "to make revolution constitutional"; that is, to enable the people to accomplish fundamental change by peaceful means. To construe the oath of office or qualifications for membership in a legislature so as to exclude those men who believe in the necessity of fundamental changes is simply to make representative government a farce, and to invite direct action or even violent revolution. It was appropriate that the all-night discussion which led up to the vote was a scene of great confusion. According to newspaper reporters, some of the members indulged in a good old-fashioned debauch, retiring to the cloakroom to drink

from pocket flasks of whiskey, and singing foolish songs on the floor in the midst of the debate. Senator Thompson charges that Assemblymen actually had to be carried out of the Chamber. Others, it is reported, were shooting dice not far from the Speaker's desk. Fitting obsequies, these, for the demise of representative government.

That the Socialist Party will fight to reestablish democracy is a foregone conclusion. The question is what those liberals who disapproved of Speaker Sweet's attitude will have to say. Will they, like *The World* (New York), support the reelection of the expelled Assemblymen in the next election as the only way to vindicate popular government?

The Forces Behind Sweet

THE man primarily responsible for the crime against democracy at Albany is the tool of the most reactionary financial interests in New York State. He is still using his enormous power as Speaker to kill all welfare legislation. It is probable that only the dangerous wrath of tenants forced him to consent even to the bills which curbed the power of the landlords. His machine and in general the forces that aid him have been pitilessly exposed by the New York State League of Women Voters, whose Chairman is Mrs. Frank A. Vanderlip. Mark A. Daly, lobbyist of the Associated Manufacturers and Merchants, is a close friend of Speaker Sweet. Under pretense of patriotism this Association has fought health insurance, minimum wage legislation, and everything else in the nature of reform. Daly's standards are shown in the following quotation:—"If we were asked to draw an analogy (to women in politics) we'd say that if we had a fractious horse, and after we'd fed him well, pampered him, coddled him, treated him with every kindness and attempted to talk reason at him, he still stood up on his hind legs and pawed at the air, we'd get a rawhide quirt and hire the best horseman we knew and scientifically and firmly lick the hell right out of him."

The Women's Committee also sheds light upon the so-called New York League for Americanism. A manufacturer who helped organize the League told one of its green lecturers, "The Americanism part of it is a joke . . . you can go up ahead and stir up sentiment on Americanism and other men will follow after you to attend to the freak legislation." This League is particularly interested in defeating health insurance and has boggled at no falsehoods to accomplish this end.

Senator Lusk is part of this reactionary machine. In campaigning for Speaker Sweet last fall he made this assertion:

"Why are these women backing the welfare measures? Not to benefit any class of people. They lie if they say so. It is all part of the German propaganda to break down the United States Government."

Still worse, by some means or other it has been

arranged that "boiler-plate" material should be sent out to all the papers denouncing all welfare legislation as Bolshevism on authority of the *Lusk Committee*. Patriotism like this is indeed "the last resort of scoundrels!"

France Choruses the Hymn of Hate

THE Germans have suffered fresh outrages under the terms of the Peace of Versailles. Ugly stories apparently well substantiated are in circulation with regard to the conduct of French troops in the occupied territories, and to make matters worse the French, claiming that the German government had violated the Treaty in sending troops into the Ruhr district to suppress insurrection, on their own initiative recently occupied the city of Frankfurt and other territory outside the zone of Allied control. They used for this purpose black Senegalese troops who are immune from Socialism and have no tendency to fraternize with the Germans. No possible violation of the Treaty by Germany can warrant this French action taken without the approval of the Allied powers. Even though it is now announced that the French troops will be withdrawn new mischief has been done and new fuel fed on the fires of hate in western Europe.

But if the conduct of the French government has been inexcusable there is not much to be said in praise of the German. The Ebert Government was restored to power by the workers. It made some concessions to the more conservative trade unionists headed by Legien, who seems to be one of the most powerful figures in Germany. Noske was dismissed and a new coalition cabinet formed. This cabinet was so weak that it has not dared to take any action whatever against the monarchists who temporarily overthrew it. On the contrary it used reactionary troops to fight the reds in the Ruhr district; and that at a time when according to some newspaper despatches there was reason to think that negotiations with leaders of the communists and independent socialists looking to the restoration of peace were proceeding satisfactorily.

Of course the situation is not wholly bad. Recent events have proved that Germany is not militarist and that the workers will not stand for a Junker government. Perhaps they would go farther and create a new cooperative commonwealth in Germany were it not for hunger, the exhaustion following war, fear of the Allies, and the lack of leaders. At all events, the whole world has something to gain from the success of a constructive, anti-imperialist revolution in Germany. Conversely, it has much to lose from the success of the French effort to reduce Germany to something like her condition after the Thirty Years War.

Furtive Imperialism in Siberia

"THE Russian situation will adjust itself when the Japanese leave Siberia . . . Ninety per cent. of the people in Siberia are Bolshe-

viki. They are working for peace and the good of the country, and in my opinion are trying to be fair and just to the people. The Anti-Bolsheviks do not want the Japanese to leave because of immense concessions granted to them by the crown before the Russian débâcle, and which they would lose but for the presence of the Japanese troops." This is not the propagandist statement of Mr. Martens' Soviet Bureau, but it comes from no less distinguished an authority than Brigadier-General William C. Graves, commander-in-chief of the American expeditionary forces, upon his arrival at Manila with the last of the troops from Vladivostok. It furnishes sufficient comment upon the action of the Japanese in taking Vladivostok and in maintaining their armies in Siberia. For such action there is no shadow of excuse of protecting legitimate Japanese interests against Bolshevism. It is economic imperialism of the same type which is behind the American occupation of Santo Domingo and the British annexation of Egypt.

John Spargo and other defenders of the President's policy of maintaining American troops in Siberia have argued that by so doing we restrained the Japanese. The argument was thin. On the contrary, our intervention gave moral support to Japanese intervention. There was opposition in Japan to the sending of an expeditionary force. We made the work of the Japanese militarists easier, not harder, when our troops went to Siberia. The fact that the soldiers themselves, from General Graves down, were opposed to the high-handed acts of the Japanese and won some measure of affection from the Siberian people does not justify the action of our Government in keeping them there as a virtual aid to the Kolchak forces. That American soldiers should have intervened in Siberia and fought at Archangel was a consequence of high-handed executive usurpation, a crime against America as well as against Russia. One can only be thankful that the men themselves made as clean a record as they did.

A Forward Step in Industrial Unionism

AT their coming international conventions the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Amalgamated Textile Workers will consider proposals for organic union. The Amalgamated Textile Workers, which has made substantial progress during the first year of its life, has from the beginning had the counsel and aid of the Clothing workers, who constitute one of the strongest and most progressing organizations in America. A union of the two ought to add to the effectiveness of both. Two ends will be gained. (1) For the first time in history there will be a body strong enough and sincere enough to make an honest attempt to organize the textile workers of the whole country. The making of cloth is surely a basic industry. About one million workers are employed in it. They are very imperfectly organized; in the South they are

almost wholly unorganized. The average wage is low and hours and conditions of work are bad. No industry has a worse record for the exploitation of women and children. A union with the strength, skill, and point of view of the Amalgamated could eventually undertake even the task of organizing the Southern mills—a task which is essential to the progress of labor in the United States. (2) A fusion of the two Amalgamated unions would be a victory for industrial unionism; the whole process of making clothes from the spinning of the cloth to the finished garment would then be organized under one union. It is quite impossible to develop solidarity of labor or self-government in industry so long as the workers are divided laterally into craft unions.

American Aspects of The Irish Issue

DESPITE Chancellor Day, Bishop Wilson, the New York Methodist Conference, the New York Times, and other ardent pro-Britons, the Irish issue deeply concerns America. In its recent developments, it raises important questions of constitutional government and civil liberty in this country. A scholarly pamphlet by Dr. Wm. J. Maloney argues that Congress has already passed resolutions with regard to Ireland which by American precedents are tantamount to recognition, and that the President by ignoring them and by refusing the Senate's request that the Irish delegates be permitted to state Ireland's case at the Peace Conference, exceeded the proper bounds of executive authority, and in effect intervened in the Anglo-Irish dispute against Ireland. Still more pressing is the issue of civil liberty. During Easter Week American women concerned to preserve the peace of the world picketed the British Embassy bearing banners calling attention to the dangers of massacre in Ireland and asking for the withdrawal of troops. News of this was cabled to British liberal and labor organs of opinion. Secretary of State Colby dug up an ancient law forbidding insult or injury to representatives of foreign powers under which these women were arrested and are now held for trial. Meanwhile they retorted by picketing the State Department with banners containing Mr. Colby's declarations of sympathy with Ireland at the time of the Easter Week rebellion. The issue here is plain. Whatever one may think about the wisdom or good taste of picketing the British Embassy, so long as the women confined themselves to such peaceful methods of persuasion as the public display of facts about Ireland inscribed on banners, they are within what are or ought to be the civil rights of American citizens. There is no "divinity which doth hedge about an embassy" in these democratic days which makes it a crime to stage in its vicinity a dramatic and peaceable appeal to the moral sentiment of mankind. Indeed, it is only by some effective appeal to the

reason and conscience of the world that it is possible to avert war and strife.

Ireland's Unbroken Courage

EASTER Week passed in Ireland without the attempted rising which the British authorities professed to fear and the massacre of which the Irish themselves were in dread. But raids and political arrests continue at the rate of over one thousand a week. There is a certain portion of the American press which loves to dwell upon occasional cold blooded assassinations which it charges unjustly to the Sinn Fein, and utterly ignores the provocative acts of a government which rests wholly upon force. Government which has no basis but military might is in itself a crime and cannot be expected to prevent crime or secure private justice to individuals. In no proper sense does it govern; it only hinders the functioning of a proper government acceptable to its citizens. That the English government in Ireland rests upon force has been candidly admitted by Lloyd George, who, when questioned in Parliament, said that it was impossible to consider Irish self-determination because that meant an Irish Republic! To be sure, the courage of the Irish themselves, and Mr. Lloyd George's fear of liberal opinion in his own country and throughout the world makes him shrink from the extreme of ruthlessness. The resolute hunger strikers in Dublin jail won their strike and secured rules for "ameliorative treatment" for the scores of Sinn Fein prisoners held without trial. When Mr. Bonar Law admitted that the hunger strikers were held only on suspicion, but announced that the British Government would not yield, even though the prisoners died, a general strike was called in Ireland which united all classes of the population outside of the little corner around Belfast. It was an extraordinary demonstration of national feeling before which the British had to bow. It may be that the sheer necessity of the situation will force the Irish to perfect these weapons of passive resistance which will be more effective against the might of England than any armed uprising. They are far more likely to convert British Labor to the justice of the Irish cause, and in such a conversion lies the best hope of peace and friendship.

Rough Handling for Aliens

HABEAS CORPUS proceedings in behalf of various communists, real and alleged, who have been detained at Deer Island have been instituted before Judge Anderson. This paragraph is written before the hearings are completed, but Judge Anderson has already brought out some astonishing facts as to the autocracy, cruelty, and unreason of the procedure of the Department of Justice. Acting Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, in canceling certain deportation warrants, has also severely criticized the Department of Justice.

Ouija—Summon Thomas Jefferson!

THE final achievement of the Sweet-Lusk ring was the passage by the Legislature of three bills. The first gives the Attorney General power to go into any county in New York on his own initiative and bring proceedings for criminal anarchy. To enable him to do this effectively he is empowered to appoint a number of assistants (who are exempt from the Civil Service Laws) to run down criminal anarchy. These men under Chapter 595, Laws of 1917, can when authorized by the governor conduct star-chamber proceedings in matters affecting "public peace, safety, and justice." Individuals summoned before this investigator are subject to fine or imprisonment if they divulge any of the questions asked them. In short, the Attorney General is empowered to establish a new office of the holy inquisition, for the service of the State. Some ouija board expert ought to get Thomas Jefferson's opinion of such legislation!

The second bill is avowedly aimed at the Rand School, though it can be applied to labor colleges and all sorts of educational ventures. It gives power over all teaching to the Board of Regents of the State of New York. Interpreted literally, it would require a mother who taught a group of her own or her neighbors' children reading, writing, or arithmetic to get a permit. From the operation of this drastic act schools maintained by religious bodies and schools which already have received from the University of the State of New York the right to give degrees are exempted.

The third bill provides for the issuing of certificates of qualification to public school teachers by the Commissioner of Education specifying that he or she is of good moral character and will support the constitutions of the state and nation and is loyal to the institutions and laws thereof. The certificate is issued after examination and is revokable without hearing. Teachers have already been found disloyal for expressing doubts of the truth of those sweeping attacks upon Soviet Russia which even our capitalistic papers are beginning to repudiate, so that there is small hope for a liberal or reasonable interpretation of loyalty. This bill will come close to completing the ruin of the public school system of which Americans were once so proud. With such laws enforced, the schools more than ever will become a propaganda agency in the service of the political state. Americans generally have rejected the idea of propaganda control of education in the interest of the Roman Catholic church, yet there is something far nobler about the teaching of authoritarian theology and the worship of God than about the teaching of jingoism and the worship of the capitalistic political state. It is unnecessary to add that a law of this sort will encourage hypocrisy and deception on the part of the teachers.

Not content with these measures, Speaker Sweet has had introduced in the Assembly two bills which aim to deprive the Socialists of existence as a political party, disfranchise them individually, and debar any of them from public office. They would accomplish this end by giving the Appellate Division of the Third Judicial District power to pass upon whether or not "the principles, doctrines, or policies" of any party would, if carried into effect, tend to "the destruction, subversion, or endangering" of the constitutions of the United States or the State of New York, or of the "rights, privileges, and institutions" secured under these constitutions. A committee of the New York City Bar Association has sweepingly condemned these measures. It points out that they are probably unconstitutional, that they give to courts political power contrary to our whole theory of government, and that they are so absurdly drawn that they might disfranchise advocates of a repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment or single-taxers who do not believe in absolute ownership of land, which is of course a right at present guaranteed under the Constitution.

All the bills have one reason and one reason only for existence. They are intended (stupidly, in the opinion of more enlightened folk) for further protection of the exploiting classes who make the political state their tool. Two centuries before Karl Marx, Harrington wrote: "The distribution of power follows the distribution of property." Few serious social thinkers would dispute his proposition, or its corollary that under a system where two or three per cent. of the people control the national wealth the state exists primarily to protect private property. J. A. Hobson, the English economist, would have us say not "property" but "improperty," meaning thereby that form of individual wealth which is made possible by special privilege, by monopoly, by absolute ownership of land and natural resources, and the like. In a democratic state with popular suffrage in order to make government the efficient servant of the House of Have, it is necessary that the Havenots should be carefully taught what to think. The bills which Sweet-Lusk ring have fostered are a crude, ruthless attempt to complete this enslavement of the minds of the people. They are to be intimidated by secret investigations, denied opportunity for education on other than approved capitalistic lines, and if worse comes to worst deprived of their representation in the legislature. Clever men than Messrs. Sweet, Lusk and Company might never have brought the true nature of the modern political state so clearly to light. The record they have made in Albany may therefore prove to be a blessing in disguise.

Is Our Navy Responsible for Corrupting Youth?

By A. Y. M. C. A. SECRETARY IN CHINA

We have forwarded a copy of the following letter received from a reader of THE WORLD TOMORROW to the Secretary of the Navy. The charge seems to us serious enough to warrant investigation and action.

O HANKOW, CHINA, February 27, 1920.
UT here in the heart of China it is hard to keep in touch with the Homeland, but sometimes, even at this distance, we get a view of the way things are going that possibly you who are right on the spot do not have.

We understand that last Autumn, when the Flagship *South Dakota* sailed from New York, a good deal of publicity was given to the fact that 1,600 men who had enlisted for service in the Orient were sailing on this ship. I wish to ask whether certain other facts were given equal publicity.

I have talked with a great many sailors who came out on the *South Dakota*, and who have been stationed on the various gunboats that guard American interests on the Yangtze River. The story I get from all of them is the same. In the first place, a goodly percentage of the initial 1,600 were under age, even under seventeen, the age supposedly required in cases where the parent has given consent. They were fifteen and sixteen, many of them. While writing this letter I have heard of a boy who came in the most recent group, who was only fourteen when he sailed from New York last Fall. I myself have talked with one sailor boy after another who has confessed, "I was only fifteen and passed as seventeen." These are not the exception. In each new group that I have observed, going through this port, there have been a number who were under age, and practically all the older ones appear to be eighteen or nineteen at the most. Again and again I have heard the remark, "What is the Government thinking of to send such a bunch of kids to China?" To be sure, they lied to get in. But does anyone suppose they fooled the examining officials? They do not fool the people out here. Their extreme youth is only too evident. According to the stories, the examiners made it easy, at least in some cases, for an underaged boy to pass.

What kind of a trip did they have? We may judge partially from the fact that the much-advertised crew of 1,600 had dwindled to the neighborhood of 1,400, so the sailors tell me, before the *South Dakota* reached her destination. The Navy Department alone can give the exact figures. The rest had preferred desertion, with all the risks involved, to continuing in the Navy. It would seem that either conditions on board were pretty bad, or the boys were entirely too young to stand up under the hardships. The sailors give both of these rea-

sons. They say the food was awful—often uncooked. The potatoes gave out, and for two weeks the crew was on "emergency rations." The crowding and filth were unbearable. Boys were assigned brutally to tasks for which they were wholly untrained and unfit. On the other hand, a great many were simply homesick. They "wanted to go home to mother." Well, wasn't that where they belonged?

Now the conditions on board the *South Dakota* may or may not have been suitable for grown men. Personally, I am persuaded that they were not. But certainly they were not fit for growing boys of from fourteen to eighteen years of age. However, it served but as an introduction to the seductiveness of the port cities of the Orient. One fact, I think, cannot be disputed. China is not the place for a fifteen-year-old boy, thousands of miles from his parents and thrown on his own resources as regards his leisure time. He gets out here with every home restraint gone. He is so homesick he is counting the days until his return—a year and a half hence. Life on the ship is "an absolute bore."

What happens? There is no use blinking the facts. A man can not only "raise a thirst" East of Suez; he can let his passions rob him of the best that life holds. Before he has ever seen manhood, he may be broken in health from one of the dread diseases, and stripped bare of his self-respect. I can see, any day, boys just like that. A few days ago I happened to learn that seven, from the little boat then stationed here, made the trip to the doctor's to be treated for a venereal disease. The boys tell me that these are but a handful of the many who have been dragged under. Knowing conditions out here, I have to believe it. I hope you will realize what I mean when I say that anything else would be incredible.

It isn't square. These boys are not getting a fair chance. At home, they do have at least a fighting chance to "come clean." Out here it is different. Everything seems to have the downward tug. They are like men thrown overboard with a leaden weight on their feet. How can they be expected to swim? If those parents who gave their consent to their seventeen-year-old boys joining the Navy could clearly see what they were getting into, none of them would have given that consent. If the officials who were responsible for passing on the boys had the facts, and a sufficiently keen and sympathetic imagination, they would never have passed those

under age. The whole thing seems to be one more illustration of the general ignorance in America of real conditions in the Orient.

Why do these children have to be sent? (Many are no more than that.) I understand it is because *men* refuse to enlist for the low pay of a sailor. For a few dollars the lives of these boys are being damned.

It makes a man clench his fist and wonder what he can do. Thousands of miles from home, I can only hope that someone will investigate this matter to the bottom, and help bring about a reform. The

age of eighteen is too young for service in the Orient. Twenty would be an improvement. The least that can be done is to require a strict enforcement of the present regulation. But that will probably be impossible with the present wage scale. Well, then, if we must have a Navy, we must at least expect to pay for it. I submit that it is better to pay for it where possible in dollars rather than in wrecked lives.

RALPH B. COLSON,

Executive Secretary, Hankow Association,
Wu-han Young Men's Christian Association.

A Red Wedge in the Brotherhoods?

THE widespread railroad strike is causing inconvenience and loss. The public is indignant. The officers of the regular railroad brotherhoods profess to be as indignant as the public, and Mr. Lee (who favors General Wood for President) and some other old-line leaders, if quoted correctly, have actually encouraged the Government to "have the law" on the strikers. The strike began with the Chicago yardmen who adopted a constitution as far back as January 3, 1920. Their new union grew out of a mass meeting of switchmen which in October, 1919, respectfully requested action on the wage demands presented two months previously. No answer came, from Director General Hines, but from W. G. Lee, President of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the men received a scathing rebuke for acting over his head. Copies of the documents are in our possession. The yardmen were admittedly receiving less than a living wage. Impatient of months of delay, disillusioned with a government and with unions that did nothing for them while the cost of living soared, the men formed a new union with this motto: "Cooperation, Harmony, More Money, Better Working Conditions, the Elimination of all Physical Examinations and the Age Limit." Hardly an I. W. W. or Bolshevik slogan! The new union did not immediately strike. It waited. It saw the Plumb Plan contemptuously ignored by Congress, which restored the roads to their owners with elaborate protection for stockholders of both watered and unwatered stock. (The railroads now lose nothing by the strike. The taxpayers foot the bill.) Finally came the strike. Only then did Mr. Wilson appoint the Board authorized by Congress, to whom the demands for wage increases are to be presented. Dr. Palmer diagnosed the case as communistic revolution and trotted out his old family medicine—repression. Under the Lever Act he arrested the alleged leaders of the strike. Meanwhile adventurous college boys and irate commuters are learning at first hand whether firemen and yardmen have an easy job and too much pay.

As we write, the strike seems to be breaking. It has at least hastened action on wage demands and given evidence of the intention of the rank and file to think and act for themselves. Whether it has made many of the workers think (as real radicals would desire) in terms of control instead of wages is yet to be seen. At any rate, Mr. Palmer has done no good. The cure for strikes is not compulsory labor. Mr. Hoover, in commenting on the failure of the President's Industrial Commission to recommend compulsory arbitration pointed out that it had not worked in Australia.

The Kansas system of compulsory courts is illustrative. Governor Allen's pet plan worked magnificently for several weeks; nobody wanted to strike. Then some coal miners found conditions of labor unacceptable and struck. The Miners' Union was ordered to bring its case to the Industrial Court. The President refused and is still in jail for contempt of court. The strike thereupon spread in sympathy with him until all the coal miners in the state were out. The law mined no coal. On first glance the idea of an impartial industrial court seems fair and the strikers unreasonable, but in reality no such legislation can secure justice. Where and under what conditions a man shall work is not a matter which can safely be left to the determination of any court no matter how well-intentioned. Inevitably such a court is composed of well paid men who themselves do not belong to the laboring class, and whose sympathies are necessarily more with maintenance of the continuous processes of industry than with the securing of freedom. The way in which public sympathy has gone in this strike is illustrative. The public, having tolerated all sorts of profiteering by capital, flames with indignation against the "tyrannous" demands of labor. Under these circumstances justice cannot be done. Strikes with all their waste will continue until society is organized on a basis which makes co-operation, not exploitation, its principle. In other words, what we need is less law and more gospel.

The Christ of the Bolsheviks

Through the kindness of Mr. Isaac Don Levine we have received several copies of the magazine of the Russian Tolstoyans, "The Voice of Tolstoy, and Unity." The following sketch, translated for us by Mr. Laurence Miller, appeared in the issue of June, 1918. It is significant not only as an intimate picture of Russian life, but for another reason. In 1918 the Bolshevik Government was fighting for its life. Yet this pacifist magazine could frankly call the Bolshevik murderers with "soiled, bloody hands." The magazine was not suppressed.

A MUDDY Moscow street warmed by the rays of the March sun. Before the entrance of a store a long line of people stretches for several blocks. Near a letter-box is a wall covered with announcements, advertisements, decrees of all sorts; and those in line, not having anything else to do, are reading them. A lad of about nineteen, who looks neither like a militiaman nor like a Red Guard, reads aloud:

"On Thursday, March so-and-so, in the Moscow Military Academy, there will be a lecture in the interests of the children of the proletariat, on the theme: 'The Christ of the Bolsheviks—the Christ that lost His patience—Christ the forgiving!'"

"Who is that?" pipes up a poorly dressed old woman, huddled together with the cold. "Who will their Christ be: Lenin or Trotsky?"

"What do you mean, old grandmother? This is about the real Christ."

"Oh, yes. So now you are getting after Christ! First you got after the Church—now it is Christ!"

"Everything is yours!" a modestly dressed woman breaks in bitterly.

"Well, is it yours?" retorts the youth, provoked.

"I guess you're a disguised bourgeois."

"But what's that got to do with Christ?" other voices join in.

A voice is heard from the back of the crowd. "Well, that's simple. Christ is for us, therefore He's for the Bolshevik. 'Come unto me all ye that labor.' Certainly He was for the proletariat. Christ is the workman's God, the peasant's, the God of everyone that toils."

All look around. The man who is talking wears a soldier's overcoat. His face is young, but it bears the marks of suffering and hard experience. He has on new overshoes, and his head is covered with a fur cap. Stirred by his words, everyone begins to talk at once, and for a moment there is confusion in which nothing can be heard distinctly.

Suddenly a housekeeper, appointing herself chairman of the impromptu meeting, calls:

"Hold on! We won't get anywhere this way. Let's go at this thing in an orderly way. Now who wants to say something?"

The soldier is asked to stand closer to the wall. A woman steps out, her appearance indicating that she is a servant.

"How is Christ the God of the laborer? Just think about it. The law of Christ is for everyone.

Christ told us to love and forgive. Could Christ have told us to go out and do harm to anyone, even a bourgeois? And what kind of a Christ is this? . . . It's plain anarchism."

"Wait a minute, Annitz," says the soldier. "Don't be in a hurry. In the first place, even Christ said He didn't come to bring peace on earth but a sword—that means struggle. Second, from what you say you ought to know that He chased the business men out of the Church. Now do you see who He directed His sword against? Against the bourgeois. And he called unto Himself all those who were toiling."

"But how about this? According to you, Lenin and Trotsky are from Christ and for Christ—or perhaps Christ is for them. How about the Red Guard and all their slaughter, then? Is that from Christ, too? Did you ever read even one of Christ's teachings? He forbade us even to injure a fly. He forbade us to curse. He forbade killing. And yet you say, 'The Christ of the Bolshevik!' Just a little while ago I heard someone, an anarchist or else a Bolshevik, say that if Lyof Tolstoy were alive he'd be for you, too. And the man had a revolver in his hand and a gun on his shoulder! I asked him whether he knew anything about Tolstoy. . . . Who was Tolstoy? Tolstoy was on the side of Christ. He, too, loved all men. He even refused to eat meat; and you, you make chopped meat out of people. So now it's Christ that's a Bolshevik! . . . Yes, He's forgiving. He will even forgive you murderers, when you repent your deeds. But just now He's certainly not with you—you've gone far away from Him. You can't get near Christ with your killing in secret. You ought to look around and think things over. Then only could you understand Him. But now don't dare touch Him with your soiled, bloody hands!" . . .

The crowd is silent. For a time a quiet thoughtfulness settles over everyone; then there is a murmur here and there, while some cross themselves.

The soldier tries to speak again, but they are all against him. . . .

"Shame!"

"Enough!"

"We don't care."

"Go to your Bolsheviks and leave Christ alone."

In confusion, the soldier moves back to the end of the line.

Mr. Gompers and the Labor Party

By JAMES C. HICKEY

"THE workers of America," said Mr. Samuel Gompers in his remarkable letter rebuking the bold Mr. Mitchell of the Indiana State Labor Party, "must use the tactics of success. They must have results."

That was before Congress had passed the railroad bill, in surprising defiance of Mr. Gompers' solemn warnings, and before President Wilson, equally defiant or sceptical of the power of the A. F. of L., had signed it. Since that time Mr. Gompers has been very busy marshaling his forces to annihilate the daring Congressmen who voted for the bill, in case they have the hardihood to stand for reelection in the fall.

The Federation is to throw its full strength into the campaign, according to Mr. Gompers, but it will make the fight entirely within the ranks of the old political parties, giving its support in one district to the Democrats and in another to the Republicans. Only in the party primaries are any out-and-out labor candidates to be put forward. In the main it is to be a new and more aggressive application of the old policy of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies." The result, Mr. Gompers seems to believe, will be a new Congress well disposed toward the cause of labor.

He sees no other way of accomplishing such a result. "The effect of a separate political Labor Party," he told the Indiana rebels, "can only be disastrous to the wage earners of the country, and to the interests of all forward-looking people. The votes that would go to a labor candidate would, in the absence of such candidate, go to the best man in the field. In no case would they go to an enemy of labor."

And again: "Labor can look upon the formation of a political Labor Party only as an act detrimental to the interests of labor and exactly in line with that which is most ardently desired by those who seek to oppress labor."

One wonders what Judge Gary, for instance, would say to that. Is there, in fact, anything which the enemies of organized labor fear more than the entrance into the political lists of a strong national Labor Party? They realize, if Mr. Gompers does not, what such an organization could achieve.

LABOR'S POLITICAL WILL-O-THE-WISPS

The professional politician is not at all worried by the big noise Mr. Gompers is making. He does not believe that the mass of the union workers will take orders from the president of the A. F. of L. in the coming campaign. He knows how his party has held its share of the labor vote in the past, and

he has no good reason to believe that it will be any more difficult to hold it in the future. A suitable plank in the platform, a little flattering oratory, and the thing is done. "Jim Woodruff voted for the railroad bill, to be sure; but, my friends, let me tell you why he voted for it. He voted for it because he believed—and I am firmly convinced that time will show he was right—that he was raising American labor to a higher plane." Loud cheers for the Honorable Jim! The voters of Millville may accept the leadership of Mr. Gompers in union affairs, but when he attempts to shift them back and forth between two political parties, making Republicans of them one year and Democrats the next, it will be surprising indeed if large numbers of them follow him.

Are these the tactics of success? What reason has Mr. Gompers for believing that a plan which has failed consistently in the past is going to succeed now? Doesn't he know, if he does succeed in defeating a Woodruff and electing a Smith, that Smith will no more be a labor Congressman than his predecessor was? Both probably are mediocre lawyers of the glad-hand type. Both probably own a little railroad and steel stock. Neither has any direct interest in the receiving end of the wage problem, or in factory and mine conditions. Rarely indeed does a man of this sort rise superior to his class instincts, his prejudices, and his personal interests. When capital and labor are at odds he is naturally on the side of capital. Granted that he may be a decent chap at heart, we mustn't expect great things from him.

COMPLEX ISSUES DEMAND A SEPARATE LABOR PARTY

The success of the Anti-Saloon League and of the Woman's Party in achieving the triumph of their causes by the method which Mr. Gompers persists in following is wholly misleading. Each of these parties had one distinct and definite issue in support of which it was willing to let everything else go. Labor has no such single and distinct object in view. The economic and political issues in which labor is involved today are too complex to be met in the Gompers fashion. A Congressman may be for higher wages and collective bargaining and at the same time be an imperialist and a Negro-baiter and in general quite serviceable to reactionary interests.

But Mr. Gompers says a Labor Party could not win elections. No one imagines that under present conditions it could put a labor President in the White House or gain control of Congress. The conservative rural vote is too strong for that, and

will be for many years to come. And it is not going to be the easiest thing in the world to wean the workers away from their old political allegiances. But even half a dozen labor representatives in Congress, or in a State Legislature, might conceivably hold the balance of power. At any rate, pro-labor voices would always be raised in the legislative halls in a crisis such as arose a few months ago when the steel strikers in Pennsylvania were denied their constitutional rights, or when the Government attempted to strangle the coal strike with an injunction. These voices would carry farther, too, than all the thunderings of Mr. Gompers in the *Federationist*.

And the mere fact of the existence of a strong and growing Labor Party could not fail to influence powerfully the policy of the older parties. Labor could not be fought successfully with the weapons of reaction. In order to prevent the liberal elements outside the ranks of the trade unions from joining hands with the Laborites a general liberalizing process would be imperative. The result would be beneficial and invigorating to American politics, whether labor won any considerable success at the polls or not.

It goes without saying that if we exclude the Socialists there is no strong political party of liberal tendencies in the United States today. As between the Republicans and the Democrats it is only a question of which are the more reactionary. Woodrow Wilson has led the Democrats by the nose and forced them on a few occasions to be liberal against their will; but Wilson's star is setting fast, and the Southern Bourbons and Tammany are coming into their own again. And who are the gods of the Republicans? It is sufficient to whisper the name of Leonard Wood. The two big national conventions this summer promise to be much alike, as indeed they always have been. There is to be a great slaughter of the Havenots by the Haves to the tune of patriotic music.

THE OLD-LINE LEADERS FAIL

As for Mr. Gompers, he is a good fighter, and he will go down with his colors flying, but go down he must. He is trying to stem a movement that will not be stemmed. The Central Federated Union of New York City has followed the lead of the Chicago Federation of Labor and declared for the Labor Party. There are signs that Mr. Gompers, though still clinging to the reins of power, feels them slipping slowly from his grasp. He has been compelled recently to give reluctant approval to several strikes which he would have condemned had he dared to risk the open revolt of a large and powerful union.

In the steel strike, organized labor, under the leadership of Mr. Gompers and his Federation, suffered a crushing defeat. The leaders of the strikers were thrown into jail or driven out of the mill towns in defiance of law, and Mr. Gompers

was unable to save them. Peaceful meetings of strikers in the open air were broken up by mounted constables, and in some instances the unions were even denied the right to assemble in their own halls. Mr. Gompers shrieked his indignation, but the strikers got no relief. Judge Gary sat back in his chair and waited and smiled. Finally, after a long and hopeless struggle, the men surrendered.

Pursuing the same tactics, Mr. Gompers has met two defeats since—one in the coal strike injunction matter and the other on the railroad bill. Still, he flies into a rage at the mere suggestion that labor should act as a political unit.

Mr. Gompers in his day and generation served the cause of union labor. At present he is a very good friend of the capitalist system, even though he is too well pleased with himself to know it, and though some Tory captains of industry are too stupid to see it. It is good business to flatter and patronize him and other "safe" leaders, and even to make some concessions to them so long as they can be trusted on all occasions to attack "Bolshevism," Socialism, and the Labor Party and to be indifferent to such things as the Plum Plan and the cooperative movement.

But the time is coming when American labor, in spite of Mr. Gompers, will act as a political unit. The Labor Party has been born and is making rapid strides toward maturity. Perhaps, when it arrives, Mr. Gompers will be a candidate for the office of National Chairman. Who can tell?

A Bit of Silver Lining

OUR search for good news was well rewarded this month. Militarism is having hard sledding, and hunting the reds is a sport which declines in popularity. The Senate overwhelmingly defeated compulsory military training and service, which in any event could not have passed the House. The House Military Committee has reduced the War Department's estimate by a cool \$600,000,000. It grants only a little over one-third of what the General Staff asks. Even our military candidate, General Wood, has seen the writing on the wall and in the west at least is running as an anti-militarist. At that, the citizens of Michigan turned him down despite—or was it because of—all the money Wall Street gave him to beat Hiram Johnson. Over 40,000 voters in Illinois took the trouble to write in Hiram Johnson's name, which was not on the official ballot, as a rebuke both to General Wood and Colonel Lowden, as the Wood managers insist upon calling the latter. Several towns in the Middle West have elected Socialist officials and La Follette carried Wisconsin hands down. Equally encouraging as a rebuke to the "red" hysteria is the fact that A. Mitchell Palmer came in at the end of the Democratic poll in Michigan. It looks as if the voters will require other qualifications of the next president than to love the army and hate the reds.

The Pew Versus the Pillow

WILLIAM E. BOHN

THE WORLD TOMORROW boasts a large number of ministers on its subscription list. We shall be disappointed if some of them do not take up Mr. Bohn's challenge.

THE worst of it is that the sinners are no better than the saints. The prevalent notion that liberal folk have left the church while old fogies have stopped there is false. Perhaps it is just a matter of taste. Some enjoy the Sunday morning nap in a pew and some prefer a pillow.

But now those who represent the pew come asking for an amazing number of millions of dollars with which to purchase new pews or to lure sure-enough-people into the old ones. So they invite the lime-light, like the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A.

During the past two years I have heard sermons from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf. I have walked and talked with the ministers from Easter to Christmas and back again. We snow-shoed in the North and swam in the South. And everywhere we talked of the function and future of the church.

Let it be understood that I am not discussing Roman Catholics or Jews or Christian Scientists or colored folk of any denomination. The other churches, evangelical, Episcopal and Unitarian, present the same problems over the entire country. Statistically they grow apace. Two of them have passed the seven-million mark. But attend a large, well appointed church anywhere and you will find thirty-seven people listening to the sermon. The multiplied millions of money to be garnered will not alter this situation.

THE TEN JUST MEN

Men who stop away from church for no other reason than that they are too lazy to get up on Sunday morning will tell you that the trouble is with the preachers. "Real men," they will tell you, "go into business nowadays." They are wrong. Preachers are not paid as well as plumbers, but as a class they measure high. In an average town there will be a small group of people, five or ten perhaps, who are the life of the place, who have some vision, some driving force. There may be a physician at the heart of this group, or a civil engineer, or, if it is a rural community, a county farm-demonstrator. If the town lies in the northern states, one or two leisure-class women may furnish the dynamic force. If it lies in the South, a lawyer may be the key-man of any forward movement, for lawyers still count in the South. Or the best man in a town may be some very solid and simple minded business man, one who could not make a speech or write an article to save his life. A school superintendent or principal may

lead the people who really count, but it is almost impossible to find a mere teacher who rises to any sort of distinction. A person of almost any calling or no calling may lead, but over the country as a whole there are more Protestant clergymen in these little forward-driving groups than men of any other craft. Not nearly all ministers can claim this sort of distinction. If there are ten of them in a town probably only one will be a live propelling force in community life. But the difficulty is not lack of quality in the men of the pulpit.

The church is supported to represent a purpose and a doctrine in which the people of our time have lost interest. If there is a heaven or a hell awaiting us beyond the grave, if a certain attitude toward a man who was executed nineteen centuries ago will determine our destination in relation to these places or states of being, then these are the supreme facts of the universe. Beside them peace and war, justice and injustice, wealth and poverty fade into neutral unimportance. But at the present time nobody cares about heaven or hell or redemption, and the best people are precisely those who worry least about their own souls.

It is not that people disbelieve. Forty years ago there would be in every neighborhood an unbeliever, a follower of Colonel Ingersoll, upon whom the revivalist might train his seventy-fives when he wanted a bit of excitement. Now there are no unbelievers, at least no anti-believers. A Colonel Ingersoll would be as impossible now as an anti-witch-burner or an anti-Greenbacker.

History should teach us due modesty. In each age a storm rages between the Big-endians and the Little-endians. Both parties appeal confidently to the future for justification. Then the future coolly ignores them. Neither party is right. Their little problem dies and if their grandchildren remember the hot disputants at all, it is usually to smile at the great heat developed over a small matter. In the new generation the vital issues of life are envisaged in some new form. There may be left in universities, in churches, in cults, persons who go on with the ancient controversy, but the great procession of life passes them by.

The simple truth is that the preachers themselves do not believe what they preach, or what they are supposed to preach. If they really believed it they would preach and live quite differently. If any man

accepted as settled fact the notion that the bulk of our population is making straight for hell-fire he would not be content to rise in his place and placidly discuss the matter once or twice a week. He would be after us like one who discovers at midnight that the house is in flames. I once saw a minister who took the doctrine of our forefathers literally. He was an unpleasant little man gnashing his teeth and tearing his hair before absolutely empty seats.

Lack of interest in doctrinal evangelicism is evident in the private converse and conduct of the average minister. Go with practically any Protestant cleric for a long walk, climb with him a mountain, or explore with him the deep, still woods, penetrate with him to the very bones of his intellectual and spiritual life. When you have reached the point where not a shred of veil separates his soul from yours—you will hear him discuss one of two topics, the inadequacy of his salary or his inability to compete with the moving pictures. He will not expect you to envy him because he is "saved" and you are not; but if your income is larger than his he will quite frankly envy you. He does not disbelieve the church's creed. He has never consciously foresworn it. He still thinks he believes it. Perhaps he does believe, in some water-tight compartment of his brain. But his central, working mind has lost all interest in it.

If he is the one worth-while man out of the ten mentioned above, the center of his really mobile impulses may be some great human cause. He may be the dynamic force in a community house, the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A. or the Boy Scout movement. This work will be what he really believes in. But then—and here is his crime, his apostasy—he will go on Sunday to the church and declaim paragraph after paragraph as though he were in a trance. Here is the church's loss and the clergy's cardinal sin. The best men in the church are not giving to the church the best that is in them.

"I WAS GLAD WHEN THEY SAID UNTO ME—"

Lack of interest in what were considered essential doctrines is mirrored in the church service. Ministers and people alike go through the service as though they had been only half awakened from a deep sleep. There are exceptions, of course, but they can take care of themselves. I speak of the average and from long and varied experience. The congregation does not expect the minister to say anything interesting. The minister does not expect the audience to be interested. How often have I discussed some great problem with a clergyman and said to myself, "This man will be worth hearing on Sunday." And then I have gone to his church and heard "the same old thing." It never occurred to him to put

into his sermon the brave things he had thought during the week.

Once last summer I helped a preacher prepare his sermon. We had discussed the evolution of humanity and the spiritual needs of men and women at the present time. Finally we had worked out the sketch of a discourse. I was feverish with interest to hear that sermon preached. While the long prayer and the hymns were dragging to their close I wondered if the man really would open up, really would awaken those people.

I smile now in retrospect. The good man had been at work in his study after I had left him. The lessons of the theological seminary, that back-water of higher education, had been put to use again. The sermon began with one of the minor prophets. I thought we should never get clear of that prophet. Political and social conditions of his time, the biography and character of the man himself, his reason for speaking as he did in the passage which had been read—all this took some twenty minutes. By the time the speaker had waded out of it the hearers were safely somnolent. Then came the message I had expected. It was vigorously put, for the preacher was a real man, or at least he had a real man buried down inside of him somewhere. People began to straighten up, to look alive. A real message will always get across. Soon it was finished. It never takes long to state truths that are definite and real to the speaker. But that was not the end. That would have been contrary to precedent and training, to stop merely because there was nothing more to say. The audience must be put to sleep again. So back to our prophet we went. Necks and backs and eyes relaxed. The Dominic was again in safe and familiar waters. No need to watch him now. Musically the Oriental phrases of the Old Testament floated on the summer air. Twenty minutes more of somnambulism—and the final hymn caught some of us nodding. This man had a message, but the gentle, rhythmic relaxation of the service was to him as sacred as a saving doctrine.

THE WORD AND THE THOUGHT

Would that for a limited time—ten years, let us say—we might banish the Bible from the church. Not the doctrines of the Bible, but its words, its phrases, its hypnotic spell. Every other book is listened to with more attention than this greatest of books, and if the clergy would not allow themselves to float about in its phrasology, they would have to say something and stop when they had said it.

A mere change in methods of public speaking would not attract considerable numbers. To be sure, people do go to forums and lecture courses. But we cannot expect to have hundreds of thousands

of lecturers in our pulpits lecturing twice a Sunday and doing it so well as to need an S. R. O. sign handy in the vestibule. The whole problem lies deeper than beliefs, deeper than formulated thoughts, deeper than any form of ceremony or manner of speaking.

Our people want life and want it more abundantly. Their subconscious beings cry out for richness of human experience. In former ages some of this richness was secured through the intimate contacts of village life and the colorful, tuneful beauty of folk-art. Both of these are disappearing. In their stead we have the movie, the public dance, the amusement park and the commercialized theater. Poor and mean they are in comparison with what they have displaced, poorer and meaner still in contrast to what we might have in their stead. But such as they are they respond to a crying need in the average human soul and body. This is not a matter of good or bad, right or wrong, ought or ought not. It is a simple, easily discernible fact. The average boy or girl of twenty gets nothing real at church. There time is measured only by the clock. In a dance-hall life is full and vivid. Every minute is measured in experiences. For myriads of men and women of middle life the theater is similarly real and satisfying. For the working classes in general the movie is a heaven of romance. They would gladly exchange their option on the one above which must be purchased with faith and good works for this one below which can be entered for eleven cents. Here they get something which they need, and with sure instinct hither they flock as regularly and enthusiastically as to the table or the well. If anyone tells them that it is better to stay at home or go to church, he is plainly a liar.

Before any minister of the gospel raises his voice against these amusements he should remember one thing. He gets, or can get, manifold thrills out of his professional routine. There are few human experiences more gratifying than to stand as the focal point, the welding, socializing influence, before an audience. Moreover, the ministerial function brings a man into dramatic contact with life at many points. Shall one who has all this say to a machinist, "You shall not go to a dance-hall?" or to a bookkeeper, "You shall not go to a theater?"

This conflict between the church and "amusements" brings us close to the heart of our subject. In Vermont, close upon the border of Quebec, I asked a high school girl why there were no boys and girls in church. "Oh," she said, "that minister just hates the young people." It was all because he opposed their dancing. I found that the parents sided with their offspring. Down in Virginia, a

whole town was wrought up over a public dance-hall. It was a clean, respectable, outdoor place. Unimpeachable matrons and one clergyman chaperoned it regularly. But to the other clergymen it was the yawning mouth of the everlasting pit. So there was only one church in that town to which a youth or maid could be lured. A similar battle is being waged in every town in this country. The ministers want to have the law on the movies or anything else that draws people away from them. There is something more than a fanciful connection between their morals and their economic interests.

A change of front would not bring the young people back. No camouflage of interest in them will be of real use. Part of the satisfaction of life lies in self-direction.

"WHATSOEVER THINGS—"

The satisfactions which nature demands must be genuine and manifold. They must not be merely intellectual or what we have come to call spiritual. Of course a leader with a clean mind and a deep spiritual life will always attract and satisfy some. But a community as a whole demands something more. It wants more than the assurance of personal salvation, but more, too, than a spiritual uplift for an hour on Sunday morning. It demands fullness of life.

What the average town offers in response to this demand is pitifully grotesque. It would not take much either in money or ideas to outbid the dance hall, the movies and the commercialized theater. There are community centers which have done it. There are Y. M. C. A.'s and Boy Scout troops which have done it. But these are not the ultimate. The highest human satisfaction comes from community in high endeavor. The love of the movie hero's triumph is but a cheap substitute for the real thing, the real thing which is possible for many and can be made possible for most. Yet get two or three clergymen together and they will talk of closing the movies or censoring them, of somehow putting them out of business.

If the church is to cater to the primal human demands it must be completely reorganized, recapitulated and remobilized. But this is another story. And, as I said before, the sinners are no better than the saints. The man who prefers his nap in bed has little enough to boast about.

"The churches are not ready for a revival. They are overcrowded with conventionality, fossilized creeds and petrified officialdom."

Rev. J. Moore,
(President of the United Methodist Church).

"The nineteenth century industrialized England killed individuality and worshipped mass production and the great god Output."

ARTHUR GREENWOOD.

On Journalism

By H. L. MENCKEN

UPTON SINCLAIR'S long anticipated philippic against the reptile press of our great Wesleyan republic, now published at last under the somewhat fanciful title of "The Brass Check," runs true to Socialist form in two salient ways. That is to say, it is full of a moral indignation that is undiluted by the slightest smear, trace or homeopathic attenuation of humor, and it winds up with a remedy that is simple, clear, bold and idiotic.

But allowing everything for his lack of humor, his chronic moral indignation, his strangely distorted will-to-believe, his hypertrophied trust in God, it must be plain to every competent observer that in "The Brass Check" he has achieved a very interesting piece of writing, a picaresque chronicle of a high order, and that the things he sets forth as facts are, in the majority of instances, undeniably true. The newspapers will denounce him as a liar debauched with Bolshevik money, the generality of laymen will suspect him of gross exaggeration, and he may find himself, in the end, with some nasty damage suits on his hands. But if my testimony is worth anything under American rules of evidence (e. g., that the deduction of a government detective is worth more than the sworn statement of an eye-witness, that every man who reads an I. W. W. leaflet may be presumed to be plotting to overthrow the Constitution by force, and that it is a proof of guilt for an accused man to send for a lawyer and demand to be confronted by his accusers), then I offer it in his cause most cheerfully. I have been in almost constant practise as a journalist since the year 1899. I have held every editorial job that newspapers have to offer, from that of dramatic critic to that of editor-in-chief. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the average American newspaper, even of the so-called better sort, is not only quite as bad as Dr. Sinclair says it is, but ten times worse—ten times as ignorant, ten times as unfair and tyrannical, ten times as complaisant and pusillanimous, and ten times as devious, hypocritical, disingenuous, deceitful, pharisaical, pecksniffian, fraudulent, knavish, slippery, unscrupulous, perfidious, lewd and dishonest.

The *New York Times* dismisses Walter Lippman's *Liberty and the News* with a supercilious wave of the hand on the ground that as Mr. Lippman has not had newspaper experience he is therefore not qualified to write about newspapers. Here is an exposé of American newspapers more deliberately damning than either *Liberty and the News* or Upton Sinclair's *The Brass Check*. It is written, moreover, not by a Socialist or even a liberal, but by a hide-bound, dyed-in-the-wool conservative who thinks that democracy is a cult of the incorrigibly ignorant and incompetent and has nothing but ridicule for Mr. Sinclair's solution of the newspaper problem. We are indebted to *Smart Set*, from the April issue of which we quote portions of the article, for this vivid, picturesque and damaging analysis of what is the matter with the American press. In fairness to Mr. Mencken, let us add that we have omitted these portions of the article which present his viewpoint on Mr. Sinclair and on the *homo boobus*—his name for the gullible, ignorant, and to his mind wholly inferior Public.

Alas, alas! I understate it horribly! The average American newspaper, especially of the so-called better sort, has the intelligence of a Baptist evangelist, the courage of a rat, the fairness of a Prohibitionist boob-bumper, the information of a high-school janitor, the taste of a designer of celluloid valentines, and the honor of a police-station lawyer. Ask me to name so many as five papers that are clearly above this average—challenge me to nominate five that are run as intelligently, as fairly, as courageously, as decently and as honestly as the average nail factory, or building and loan association, or Bismarck herring importing business—and I'll be two or three days making up the list. And when I have made it up and the names are read by the bailiff, a wave of snickers will pass over the assembly after nearly every

one. These snickers will come from newspaper men who know a shade more about the matter than I do.

CONJURING AND LAYING BUGABOOS

The problem before a modern newspaper, hard pressed by the need of carrying on a thoroughly wholesale business, is that of enlisting the interest of the inferior man, and by interest, of course, I do not mean his mere listless attention, but his active emotional co-operation. Unless a newspaper can manage to arouse his feelings it might just as well not have at him at all, for his feelings are the essential part of him, and it is out of them that he dredges up his obscure loyalties and aversions. Well, and how are his feelings to be stirred up? At bottom, the business is quite simple. First scare him—and then reassure him. First get him into a panic with a bugaboo—and then go to the rescue, gallantly and uproariously, with a stuffed club to lay it. First fake him—and then fake him again. This, in substance, is the whole theory and practise of the art of journalism in These States. In so far as our public gazettes have any serious business at all, it is the business of snouting out and exhibiting new and startling horrors, atrocities, impending calamities, tyrannies, villainies, enormities, mortal perils, jeopardies, outrages, catastrophes—first snouting out and exhibiting them, and then magnificently circumventing and disposing of them. The first part is very

easy. It is almost unheard of for the mob to disbelieve in a new bugaboo. Immediately the hideous form is unveiled it begins to quake and cry out: the reservoir of its primary fears is always ready to run over. And the second part is not much more difficult. The one thing demanded of the remedy is that it be simple, more or less familiar, easy to comprehend—that it make no draft upon the higher cerebral centers—that it avoid leading the shy and delicate intelligence of the mob into strange and hence painful fields of speculation. All healthy journalism in America—healthy in the sense that it flourishes spontaneously and needs no outside aid—is based firmly upon just such an invention and scotching of bugaboos.

SMOKE SCREENS FOR BIG BUSINESS

There is much pishposh talked about the alleged difference between yellow journals and more respectable journals. It is my honest belief, based upon twenty years of close observation and incessant reflection, that the odds, if any, are mainly in favor of the yellow journals. Taking one day with another, they are probably less malignantly mendacious. The things they lie about are largely things of no possible importance—divorce suits, petty grafts, the buffooneries of society, the doings of chorus girls. In such fields, I'd just as lief read a lie as the truth; it is usually, in fact, more amusing. But in the domain of politics, government and high finance the yellow journals probably get a good deal closer to the truth than the more austere journals, nine-tenths of which are owned by men who are engaged in some sort of exploitation. I do not say that the yellow journals make any actual effort to be exact; on the contrary, they make a palpable effort to avoid a too literal exactness. But when they go on alleging, day after day, that every politician is a scoundrel and that every public service corporation is run by swindlers and that all the operations of Wall Street have the one aim of shaking down the plain people, they get near enough to the truth for any practical purpose. They have to dramatize and fictionize that truth to make it go down. It must be made improbable in order to convince the plain people. But this, at worst, is mere shopman's exaggeration, well defended by the legal maxim of *caveat emptor*. The lying of the more respectable papers is less innocent. Its aim is not merely to sell extras to simple folk; its aim is to perpetrate a deliberate fraud upon them, to the profit of gentlemen who remain behind the scenes.

The trouble with the newspapers higher up the scale is that nearly all of them are now owned by men who regard journalism as no more than a handmaiden to some larger and more profitable enterprise—as a convenient means to the befuddling and anesthetizing of a public that would otherwise be against them—as it actually is whenever the yellow journals turn upon them and expose them. The precise nature of that larger and more profitable enterprise is not always obvious. It is easy, of

course, to put two and two together when a wealthy contractor, or land grabber, or bank manipulator buys a newspaper, or when one is bought by a man notoriously eager for high public office. But now and then the buyer is a fellow whose business is more or less reputable and who shows no yearning to sit in the Senate. What of him? Why does he hazard so much money on such a gamble? The answer is to be found very often, I believe, in his undorned *Wille zur Macht*—his quite human desire to be an important and powerful man in his community, to be courted by all the local schemers and magnificoes, to dictate legislation, to make and unmake office-holders, to pull the glittering wires of politics. And sometimes, I suspect, his ambition (or, perhaps more accurately, his wife's) is merely social.

Whatever the underlying motive or motives, the fact remains that the newspapers of the United States are fast passing out of the hands of professional journalists and into the hands of men who are primarily something else. Every issue of the weeklies devoted to journalistic gossip prints news of another important transaction of that sort. The transfers of the *Evening Post* from Oswald G. Villard to one of the Morgan partners and of the *Bennett* papers to Munsey were not isolated phenomena; they were quite typical of a general and rapidly progressive tendency. And even when no Munsey or Morgan partner appears openly, it is common for the thing to happen behind the door. One hears first that some old-time editor-proprietor has died or gone bankrupt, one hears secondly that his paper has been bought for \$2,000,000 cash by some right-thinking journalist notoriously unable to pay a poker debt of \$29, and one hears thirdly, in discreet whispers, that the real buyer is old John Guggan, the eminent sheet-asphalt contractor, or Irving Rosehill, president of Rosenberg, Cohen & Co., the patriotic banking firm, or the illustrious Senator Lucius Snodgrass, oil operator, leading Methodist layman and perpetual candidate for the embassy at St. James'. Not long ago, when Iceberg Fairbanks died and autopsy was had upon his remains, it was discovered that he had owned the leading newspaper of Indiana for years. Most of them cover it up more carefully; even the coroner is fooled. But the men who work upon a newspaper so held in pawn know pretty well what to avoid. There is in nearly every newspaper office a certain Awful Name. It precedes that of God.

EXIT DECENT JOURNALISM

On such a newspaper—that is, on the normal, the typical American newspaper—it must be obvious that the quest for truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is commonly mitigated by something not unlike policy. On the one hand, the staff has to make a paper that will sell, and is thus forced to keep the mob stirred up with the traditional buncombe, and, on the other hand, it has to avoid stepping on the large, numerous and exquisitely sensitive

toes of the Googan, or Rosehill, or Snodgrass in the background. (In my early days he was a wealthy ice-magnate, and every story that he was interested in, say nine or ten a night, went to the composing-room marked "Ice!") It needs no long argument to convince the judicious that the business of molding public opinion under such conditions tends to slacken a working journalist's hold upon the concept of truth, and, in the end, upon the concept of honor. Engaged day in and day out in propagating ideas that he knows to be untrue and idiotic, and forced to make himself an instrument of enterprises that he sometimes cannot understand and must often regard as sinister, he ends by losing all sense of public responsibility, and so becomes a mere kept blackguard, ready at the word of command to defend the guilty or to harass and prosecute the innocent. In the end a very fury of malignancy possesses him. The power is in his hands and the conscience is gone. He is simply an eighth-rate man with the capacity for evil of a Napoleon—and chronically running amok. This epidemic destruction of the ordinary decency of the journalist is responsible for many of the things complained of by Dr. Sinclair in his book—the bitter and relentless pursuit of victims, the gross contempt of common honesty, the utter disappearance of the habits of courtesy and fairness prevailing among civilized men. A paper so polluted becomes a public menace. Its word is worth nothing. It carries on its jihads maliciously, unintelligently and cravenly. It denies all hearing to its prey. An appeal to its honor is as vain as an appeal to the honor of a Congressman.

RUTHLESS POWER OF THE PRESS

What I want to make clear is the fact that such newspapers are deliberately and utterly dishonest—that they carry on their entertaining and harrowing of the mob without the slightest regard for the ordinary decencies. And what I want to make plain also is the fact that they are fast driving out all other sorts of journals. Such a paper, with power in its hands, is quite without any regard for the rights of individuals. Let a man fall a victim to its mendacity, and he is devoid of any reasonable redress. His statement of his case is distorted or suppressed. His defenders are scared off. And if, despairing of fair play, he appeals to the courts, he finds very quickly that the courts in nearly all the larger American cities fear the newspapers with a holy fear, and that the man who wins a libel action and gets his money is quite as rare as the man who bites a lion and lives to tell the tale.

Today the actual boss of a newspaper tends more and more to become a shadowy figure in the background, ignorant of newspaper traditions and ways of thinking, and heavily engaged in enterprises that have a way of colliding harshly with what remain of newspaper ideals.

A Warning to Movie Fans

FOR some time it has been suspected that the motion-picture business was being utilized by propagandists with plenty of cash. What has heretofore been a matter of suspicion is now a matter of knowledge. We quote three paragraphs from a letter recently sent out by a certain motion-picture company:

"Quietly starting with January 1st, 1920, the majority of motion-picture theaters throughout the U. S. through their associations have agreed to run motion pictures of an advertising and propaganda nature. No public announcement of this change of policy will be made.

"They justify this action by comparing themselves to popular magazines that reserve part of their entertainment pages for paid 'reading notices.'

"Personally we agree with Gilbert and Sullivan of Mikado fame when they said: 'So very much depends on the way in which it's done.' We are specialists in doing it right—making motion pictures that entertain while delivering the sales message. Frankly, we sugar-coat the pill as all advertising and publicity experts do who are successful in putting sales or ideas over."

In plain English this means that any great corporation with the cash can put across advertising in the form of a story and not label it. The danger of this situation needs no comment. Let the lover of moving pictures be on his guard whenever he sees a melodrama in which the villain is a Mexican. Who knows how much the oil interests have paid for it? And what price does the Security League pay for pictures vilifying Russia? The control of the channels of information is a better way for maintaining a virtual system of slavery than was ever the taskmaster's lash.

THE railroad strike and European news have thus far rather crowded discussion of the latest Mexican rebellion. It is, however, to be noted that our papers are not at all unfriendly to the idea of the secession of Sonora. What the average plain citizen would like to know and stands little chance of finding out is who is backing this latest revolution? Is it intended to redress legitimate grievances of the people or to satisfy the ambition of some Mexican politician? What are the American ranch, mine, and oil interests doing? Once they backed the bandit Villa. Are they now backing de la Huerta in the hope that they can weaken Mexico and easily manipulate a new puppet state? The situation has enormous possibilities. There are those who would delight to make Sonora a new Texas. The situation demands that we get light. From what we know of the past records of the interventionists, it is neither unjust nor unreasonable to be suspicious as to what is now occurring.

The Two Internationals

By ALBERT D. BELDEN

Has the Church as a world organization done anything to abolish war or to solve our urgent social problems comparable to the concerted efforts of labor? This British clergyman believes that the Church alone can found the new International. Is his faith an idle dream or a real solution? The answer will not be in the realm of argument, but of deeds.

THERE is a legend of India which tells the story of how the quails successfully escaped the snare of a clever fowler. So many flocks of quails had suffered from his unwelcome attention that at last a conference of quails was held to consider what could be done. As a result, it was decided that when next the fowler's net was flung over a flock of the birds, each quail should promptly thrust its head through the mesh above it and spread its wings instantly in flight. The result can be imagined. The birds, so helpless separately, by their united strength snatched the net from the fowler's hand and flew away with it, leaving it at their leisure where it would never again be found by its owner.

A moral for the present situation is not far to seek. Mars, the demon fowler of the human flock, flung his black net of war over the peoples of Europe, snaring them to their destruction and death. If the peoples wish for final and not temporary deliverance they must unite. Nothing is more certain than that each people was a very unwilling victim of the war-god. None of them wanted this appalling bloodshed, this atrocious crime against humanity, yet all were plagued with it and seemingly helpless to stay it. Paradoxical as the position was, it was, of course, no new one. It has always been so. War has always been made by the few and suffered by the many. And for the simple reason that the many do not realize their united strength. The few divide the many and hurl them at each other in a supposed antagonism of interests. Just so long as that operation is possible, so long will war distress the world. No question, therefore, is so urgent as the problem of how to give to the many cohesive strength and that patience with each other in which alone unity can become stable. What power can render the many so invincibly united that the few shall in future intrigue and misrepresent in vain?

TOMORROW IT WILL BE TOO LATE

The time is over-ripe for the asking and the answering of that question. The peoples of Europe have had a terrible lesson. They have just enough reserve strength now to profit by it. Tomorrow, with that reserve strength used up, they will not be able to profit by their lesson. Now is the day of salvation. The question is one, then, of the utmost urgency—an urgency that language cannot express.

The answer of Socialism to the question we have asked has been sound in principle. "The peoples must unite." An International must be formed which will insure simultaneous and united action of the democracies of the world against the forces that make for war. It was with this view that the universal strike was planned, and worked for be-

fore the present struggle began. Its abject failure in 1914 may well have sent its gallant champion Keir Hardie to his grave with a broken heart. Since then there have been spasmodic efforts to revive the international mind of Labor. With deep respect one acknowledges that Labor has been perhaps more consistent in this aim than any other body. Yet it has been a house divided against itself. The Stockholm Conference proposal failed chiefly because the British working classes did not desire it. The failure of the Socialist International is no whit less tragic or complete than is the failure of the organized Christianity of the belligerent peoples.

LET THE CHURCH AND LABOR UNITE

Now, in view of the colossal sacrifices extorted by this war, and the appalling agony it represents, it is difficult to imagine folk of any class or opinion objecting to the universal strike of Labor if it could be universal and could prevent such a tragedy. Because it has failed once is no reason why it should fail again. The Church, for example, might very well say to Labor: "For God's sake, succeed if you can." Neither, however, can one imagine Labor objecting if the Church would say: "There is an International that has not yet been seriously used or given the external force that it really inwardly possesses, namely, 'The Christian International.'" If Labor is truly alive to the meaning and urgency of the present situation, it will say to the Church in its turn: "For God's sake, succeed if you can." Between these two attempts to realize an effective International there should be no antagonism. They aim at the same great goal. If they show jealousy of each other's prestige they thereby confess themselves not yet worthy of their sacred aim.

May it not be hoped that since both Church and Labor share in common the humiliation of dismal failure they may discover a new mutual sympathy, or at least make a new attempt to understand each other? If they could become one in repentance, they might well become one in renewed faith and effort. With that end in view the writer wishes to point out certain reasons of a very fundamental nature which suggest the absolute need for a Christian International to supplement the Socialist effort.

The sanction of the Socialist International is frankly and solely human and secularist. This is true even though many of its supporters have strong religious sympathies. The appeal of Socialism is to the common interest, mainly material, of the proletariat of all lands. In the first place, however, this common interest is by no means very apparent in a largely unsocialized civilization riven by competitive industry and divided by tariff walls. In the second place, the appeal is one that develops rather than restrains the self-interest of the various democracies.

The positive dynamic of the Socialist International, being the material self-interest of the democracy, leaves the mind of the people dangerously open to other appeals to self-interest; such, for instance, as the bribes of imperialism or the fears of alien domination. The negative dynamic of the democratic movement lies in the agony of the present strife. When the people suffer enough, we are told, they will learn their lesson. But apparently the present agony must deepen into bloody revolution before the pressure on the people will be adequate to change their minds. Yet this also is a vain hope of betterment, for by the time that point of desperation is reached the chaos of human affairs will be so profound and complete that, so far from the people's being able to face the problems of reconstruction, their general cry is far more likely to be "*sauve qui peut!*" What greater reason is there to believe that the masses of Europe will learn the lesson of their travail without clear leadership and strong organization any more than did the masses of the old Roman Empire?

If, then, there is an International that can unite the people it must not wait for revolution, for it will then be too late.

If only the great Peace could have been settled by some great popular movement on an international scale the result would have been simply invaluable as a precedent for solving future international disputes and also international problems peaceably.

The danger to democracy from the Government-made peace ought not to be overlooked. The European Governments are still tainted by secret diplomacy. The poison of imperialism still lurks in their blood. The result of the Peace Treaty has been to penalize the vanquished and to compensate allies, with the consequence, not that the real criminals are punished, but that the peoples are being made to suffer further losses—losses which will strain what little international sentiment now survives to the breaking point.

It is true that President Wilson's original policy was magnificently set against any such fatal issue of European diplomacy; but the success of his policy was dependent entirely upon the genuine conversion of European statesmanship to democratic principles, which in its turn depended on democratic control of foreign policy.

CAN LABOR COMBAT HATE?

It is just here that we arrive at the crux of the whole question, and the supreme limitation of the Socialist International. The supreme obstacle at this stage is the "temper" of democracy itself in every country. What is Labor's resource in view of the spirit of hate and vengeance which has seized upon vast masses of the belligerent peoples? For example, one can cite the violent anti-German attitude of the British Seamen's Union, the outcry for a monster indemnity raised by the British, and the extreme bitterness of feeling amongst the Belgians and French—a feeling with which we can all deeply sympathize even while we realize how seriously it complicates the task of reconstruction. More recently there have been most regrettable outbreaks of racial color hatred in England and America.

To what, in face of such a feeling can a purely humanist International appeal? Can it appeal to common humanity? But it is just that which has been so grossly violated and denied. The common humanity is not there to appeal to. Here is the serious limitation of the sanction of Socialism. To urge men to a friendly attitude towards each other simply because they are men demands at least that they shall be attracted to each other and mutually likable. It is easy enough to find them likable until they wrong you. Then comes the rub, the test, and the collapse. Up to that point the Socialist International works; beyond it there is grave need for its reinforcement. In other words, the Socialist International can succeed where there is already a common sentiment of friendliness—it cannot create that sentiment or restore it where it has been destroyed.

The only remedy for the situation, then, obviously lies in a sanction which is independent of the human situation, and which comes down upon it from higher considerations altogether. In other words, the main requirement is a superhuman or divine sanction insisting upon the magnanimous forgiveness of foes, and able to provide the moral courage necessary to such self-conquest. That sanction is the peculiar possession and gift of genuine Christianity. Only half realized and but poorly applied by the Churches, it is nevertheless the only solvent of the present situation.

THE INTERNATIONAL OF FORGIVENESS

The first principle of this new European reconstruction, as we may call it, has been given classic utterance by Nurse Edith Cavell, who certainly had some claim to indulge in vengeful feeling, but who, just before her death, uttered what is easily the greatest saying of the war. Would that all Europe might heed these words! "Standing as I do, in view of God and eternity, I realize that patriotism is not enough—there must be no bitterness or hate in my heart against anyone." The power that made Edith Cavell able to say that is the only power that can remake Europe. It is the power of religion. "To err is human, to forgive divine."

The simple glaring need of the situation is, then, that there should arise in every nation a body determined to assert the divine sanction for human solidarity, and to summon the nations to obey that Spirit which is more fully honored by those who forgive most and who seek least for themselves. Now such a body exists. "There is one body." There is the Holy Catholic Church. In spite of the differences that so deeply divide the various branches of the Christian Church, there is a mighty common foundation of simple loyalty to the Spirit of Christ. The common Divinity is the natural court of appeal for broken humanity.

The Christian International has not only the supreme advantage of a superhuman sanction and resource,—it has a wider human basis than that of Labor. It can link the classes as well as the masses together, and it can reach out beyond civilization to the backward races of mankind. Moreover, it can be feared by none, for its appeal is not to arms but only to the Cross on which the world's Re-

deemer died for all. Truly presented, its appeal is irresistible by conscience. As men hope for God's forgiveness, so must they forgive each other. Let that sanction in its purity be asserted in a truly international manner and with a grand simultaneity, and it cannot fail. Let the Churches rally to their own League. Form the Christian International. State boldly, and as solemnly as possible, the Christian sanction for human fellowship, and invite the Churches of all lands to do the same. The Churches in this way would be doing more for the League of Nations than by simply blessing the merely political effort hitherto represented by that phrase. They would be providing the spiritual cement for the League of Nations.

Who could antagonize such an effort? What is there to fear from it? A common profession of Christian faith cuts across all political parties and class distinctions and social suspicions. Let but the Roman, Greek, Anglican, and Protestant Churches utter the one great Catholic word of reconstruction with one voice and at one time, and the peoples will listen even if Governments are deaf.

Are the Churches so bankrupt of the reconciling Spirit of their Divine Head that they cannot achieve this? Shall the Church which has reconciled Jew and Gentile, master and slave, Roman and Barbarian, fail with the Britisher and the German, the American and the Turk? If the Churches can do it, should it not be done quickly? Our holy dead call for the Christian International.

Our Official Black Hundreds at Work

THE first anniversary of the imprisonment of Kate Richards O'Hare and Gene Debs finds ever increasing numbers of political prisoners under state and federal laws in American jails. It also finds, however, a growing demand for amnesty. The A. F. of L. is at last definitely pledged to a general amnesty for all political prisoners including conscientious objectors. Mr. Gompers himself has endorsed this policy. Meanwhile the Department of Justice has given new evidence of its disregard of the ordinary decencies of judicial procedure. When President Wilson was in North Dakota on his western trip, Governor Frazier sent him a petition from the citizens asking for the release of Kate Richards O'Hare. Nothing more was heard of the petition until comparatively recently when the American War Mothers began to circulate a counter-petition for her retention in jail. One of our correspondents was approached to sign it, and when he told the woman who asked him that he could not he was asked for his name and address in order that he might be reported to the American Legion. Later on he learned that inquiries were actually made from some of his friends concerning his business in North Dakota. Our friend then made inquiries as to the situation from Governor Frazier. We quote his letter: "A month or so ago the petition together with the Governor's letter of transmittal appeared here in North Dakota in the hands of the American Legion. Governor Frazier

thereupon wrote to Secretary Tumulty for an explanation and was informed that the petition had been turned over to the Department of Justice.

"Governor Frazier added that the American War Mothers, to whom the American Legion had entrusted the counter-petition, had made a house-to-house canvass in Bismarck and they had not only secured the names of those who refused to sign but at least in one case had brought in a committee of legionaries to deal with a man who had refused to sign.

"This information I am forwarding to you because the question has come to me how far the Department of Justice is a party to such proceedings as this. It looks to me as if the matter would bear investigation."

We emphatically agree with our correspondent that the Department of Justice has a good deal to explain. Meanwhile we cannot believe that the American War Mothers or any other body of women would want to keep Kate Richards O'Hare in prison a single day if they but knew the truth. Mrs. O'Hare's wonderful spirit shines out in these sentences from a Christmas letter: "On this Christmas day I want you, my husband, and my children, my old mother, my brothers and sisters, my friends and comrades to be as serene and calm as I am. . . . Out of the travail of war will come the new social order; and if my share of that travail be prison, I pay the price gladly and await the future without fear."

An Experiment in Passaic

THE student of government at work must not neglect to study Passaic, New Jersey. Last month under the head "Spying on Labor" we recorded the way in which the Woolen Council controls the school system of that town. More recently they showed their control of the police. A meeting was arranged by the Amalgamated Textile Workers to test the arbitrary rule of the Commissioner of Public Safety, Preiskel by name, in refusing to allow them to meet without a permit. An orderly meeting was in progress and the constitution of New Jersey, an admirably liberal document, was being read, when the police without any warrant of law under which to arrest the speakers or prevent the meeting, drove all except a few white-collared folk out of the hall and put out the lights. They needed no law—they had night-sticks. The meeting proceeded by candle-light with a handful of auditors, but most of the workers had been kept out. Now, since the meeting, the city commissioners have passed an ordinance patterned after the one at Duquesne which makes it necessary to apply twenty-four hours in advance for a permit for any public meeting whatsoever. The constitutionality of the ordinance will be tested by the Amalgamated Textile Workers and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

The Pot Boils in the Far East

THERE is a tremendous shortage of housing accommodations in this new Japan of factories and sudden wealth. The sudden wealth side of it reckons not with the people who do the work—which is dangerous social neglect. . . . Japan's trade is suddenly going to pieces since the end of the war has given a chance for honest-made goods to crowd her shoddy stuff off the eastern markets, while the Chinese boycott and American shipping competition have added the final touch. I fear that Japan is a long, long way from learning that honesty and unselfishness are the only rules of survival in a crowded world. It would seem as though the nations back home had failed to learn that lesson, but after you have lived out here awhile it dawns on you that America and England have made a lot of progress, no matter how black things may look while you are home. However, I fear that the day of everlasting peace has not yet dawned. Japan certainly holds no such idealistic creed, and is preparing full blast for the next big catastrophe of civilization, in which she may doubtless take a more whole-hearted and eager part than in the last.

Just a word about your attitude toward the Bolsheviks in *THE WORLD TOMORROW*. I am all for a free discussion, and glad to read the good side as you present it—but all the same, I think you have the wrong dope. I'd like to agree with you, and I have certainly suspended final judgment; but if the swarms of Russians who infest this country now are any sample, I can imagine nothing idealistic from Russia—naught but brute selfishness and lust is possible. Only a free, thoroughgoing Christian religious movement can save Russia. That isn't simply my preconceived theory, either—I think I have pretty good reasons for my statement. The pot is boiling out here in the East: better give it more space in your columns!

Japan.

Yours sincerely,

D. G. H.

THE WORLD TOMORROW would be only too glad to publish more reliable news about the Far East. As for Russians in Japan, we in America had an idea that they were representatives largely of the decadent aristocracy and bureaucracy. We thought Bolsheviks, or near-Bolsheviks, were rigorously excluded. Is it fair, therefore, to judge Russia too scathingly from the particular specimens in Japan?

On Denunciation as a Form of Violence

I UNDERSTAND that you would welcome comments upon an interesting statement of principles put forth (I think) by *The Fellowship of Reconciliation*. With most of it I have deep sympathy, but I am stirred to say a word about it, and also about my

ship, by a little paragraph in your February *World Tomorrow*, in answer to a correspondent who suggests that your admirable journal more than passes the line of good temper. Personally, I have found little or nothing of what he criticises in your columns. I should say you had done admirably in these stormy times when so much happens that cries out for reprobation. And I recognize humor to be a legitimate and even necessary instrument. But what I noted in your paragraph was your defense of "denunciation," on the score that Jesus used it. There is illustrated the very kernel of all rational and spiritual objection to this constant use of Jesus as the "Perfect Example" to follow. Is denunciation the highest or wisest use of our spiritual intelligence? I doubt whether it ever does so much good, even in such hands as yours, as the general permission and justification of it do harm. I can see no positive good that it ever did (in so far as it was denunciation) in the case of the Prophets, grand as their work was. And it seems to me that Jesus, on this side of his utterances, does on the whole contrive to give a good deal of aid to all those who "in His name" are always counseling violence. What are violent language and the violent temper but a form of violence, lending itself, with one degree more of emotion, to blows, punishment, and war. It looks as if Jesus, in his zeal for the oppressed, failed here to see the implications of His own highest teachings. What would you expect of Him? But why should we follow herein His bold example, instead of tracing the more beautiful and far more efficient law of the working of the spirit of brotherhood, sympathy, forgiveness? The Christian Church will be extremely slow in learning how to forgive as long as you cheerfully permit them all to denounce, either their own enemies, or (the same thing in their minds) the enemies of the good.

So much on the negative side, as regards the objection to taking Jesus' conduct as a model for men. But the positive objection I consider far more important. The moment you differentiate a single life from all the lives of all the good and true of the race and exalt that life as perfect in every respect, compared with the other imperfect (sinful) lives, do you not see the depressing practical conclusion? One, by express exception from ordinary conditions, has succeeded, *ergo*, no one else can ever succeed! I see no fine and normal comradeship with this kind of Jesus. As a matter of fact, I find everywhere a common attitude of hopelessness on the part of the average man as to the practicability of the good life. One of the most serious handicaps upon the Christian Church is the common opinion that the deep spiritual laws are all too fine for us to obey. "Only one ever did this." I appeal, therefore, from the narrower rule of the authority and example of Jesus to the law—higher and more beautiful and imperative, above all rules and personal models—for which not Jesus only but a long line of brave men and women have stood.

Honolulu.

C. F. DOLE.

From the Mother of a Soldier

ALLOW me to compliment you upon your splendid magazine. I hope it will prosper. How good it seems to read something amid the welter of words that sound like truth—not "propaganda." The article from the pen of George D. Herron in your February and March issues is particularly fine, as also the one entitled "Religion's Limitations."

I lost my fine boy in this cruel, needless war. Espionage was forced upon us when our boys marched away to death, and now our cries of sorrow and clamorings for justice are under espionage still. The injustice that causes agitation is much more to be feared than the agitation itself. During the war I stood aghast at the attitude of the church. I say this with all respect, being a church member. I am not an extremist; I can only say: how long will the feelings of those in high places be protected by the label "Handle with care," while the world is suffering from their acts? War is a questionable means to an end at any time, and if the world war is under suspicion, and proved guilty, I see no honest course for the church but to acknowledge its too great responsibility, and beg forgiveness, as it asks the sinner to do. A service flag was hung in almost every church; the atmosphere was compelling. I see no chance for reconstruction either in church or nation that will really gain the confidence of men without making amends.

Indiana.

F. E. B.

Relief Work in Germany

The following are extracts from letters we have received from two representatives of The American Friends Service Committee in Germany. Solomon Yoder was one of the group sent to Germany to pay the families of the German prisoners who had worked for the Friends Unit in France. Arthur C. Jackson spent six weeks in Germany at the request of the Committee. We regret that space does not permit us to give these letters in full.

IT was late one afternoon that I arrived in the historical city of Jena. Here I visited the Michel family. I found the father, mother, and a brother of sixteen at home, and when I showed them the photograph of the missing son and brother they stood amazed. Emotion caused the father and mother to be speechless, but the young brother was so excited and anxious for news that he could scarcely speak fast enough. When I left, the mother wept, and as I had good-bye to the brother at the railway station he almost embraced me.

At Kitzhütte I visited Frau Greiner and found her alone with three small sons, bending over a wash-tub. She told me how much her missing husband meant to her and how hard it was for her to earn enough to feed her family. The children were much undersized and looked very hungry. As I parted, Frau Greiner gasped between broken sobs, "So much money I have never had in my hand before. I shall never, never forget you."

It is very difficult to write our experiences as they come to us. The sensations and emotions of joy which the families experience cannot be penned. The people in the Thüringen district are all very poor and need help badly. But in return for our help, they almost want to refund some of the money for our

service. Could the people in the homeland but see the joy of beaming faces, starving children fed, ragged children clothed, and hear the sobs of a mother's gratitude, they would see what their generous contributions have made possible.

Bomberg, Bayern.

SOLOMON E. YODER.

THE tremendous reduction in the purchasing power of the mark has much exceeded the earning capacity of the average workman. For instance, before the war the price of a pair of working man's good leather shoes was about 15 marks. Today it is about 300 marks, and these shoes are not nearly as good. Wages, on the other hand, have advanced from 4-5 marks a day to 25-30 marks a day, so that the shoes have advanced twenty times their former price and wages about six times. . . . One of the most trying conditions to me is the ability that one with money has of getting anything he wants. In the hotels and restaurants he can buy almost anything, even coffee with milk and white bread with butter, while thousands of children are starving, and none over two years of age and many under are entirely unable to get any milk at all. The underhanded system by which such foods are procured and sold is called *Schleichhandel*, and is a large business here, in which it is said many are getting rich. . . . The government has made the mistake, I think, of paying the farmer for his crops much less than their cost of production. Consequently the farmer is not encouraged to work his ground to full advantage, hides as much of his crop as he can, and sells these things to the food speculator. This makes a severe shortage in foods, which the government distributes on ration cards. The people buy at a price much below the government cost, the difference being made up by the printing of paper money without reserves and by taxes, which are very, very severe. The amount of food one gets by means of ration cards is less than 55% of a normal ration.

It is probably well known that Mr. Hoover has two plans by which America can help the situation here. For one, he has his direct representative here, through whom anyone in America can contribute by depositing in any bank ten or fifty dollars and have the value in a standard food package delivered to any designated person in Germany. The other scheme, which The American Friends Service Committee went over to operate, is intended entirely for children's relief. Mr. Hoover's organization is standing the entire expense of purchasing and transporting costs from American factories to Hamburg; we have arranged with the government for free receiving and storage; so that we will be able to deliver to the German children one dollar's worth of food for every dollar contributed for this purpose in the United States. The children we are feeding are those whom the city doctor certifies to be in an undernourished condition. After careful investigation we find the need to be enormous, and we can only hope to take care of the worst cases. The effect of undernourishment on the children is very apparent. The children from 8 to 14 years of age are 2 to 3 years behind in their physical development. The increase of tuberculosis among children is appalling, and the number of children suffering from rachitis is shocking. Most assuredly any money contributed for this purpose will be well spent.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON.

Towards the Actors' International

NOT without reason, I sometimes think, did the Greeks conceive of man as a plaything created for the amusement of the gods. Even now the curtain is falling on one act of the Olympian vaudeville, and from the invisible gallery there is the thunder of ironic laughter. And certain Old Men, who were the stars of this mirth-provoking turn, gaze upward for the applause that is their due.

The act shows a land in which those of whom it was once said they "shall inherit the earth" took it into their own hands to bring this prophecy true: a land called in earthly language Russia. But the fulfilment of this prophecy was not pleasing to the Old Men (perhaps because it threatened to do away altogether with their rôle as stars in the cosmic burlesque); so the Old Men decided that here was fair bait for the amusement of the gods.

First they spread abroad over all the lands of the earth a subtle acid of biting lies and calumnies. This so ate into the minds and inflamed the hearts of the hearers that it will be half a score of years before the common man knows and understands the true way of things in Russia. Then about Russia the Old Men drew a *cordon sanitaire* like the magic ring that Merlin drew about those he cursed; and beyond that lethal ring could no man pass, nor any food, nor any medicine, nor any other thing that human beings need if they are to live: so that within the ring men and women and babes perished miserably of hunger and of every foul disease. Then the Old Men stirred up the border states against Russia, and set brother to stabbing brother in internecine warfare, until the land was a great bleeding wound. Likewise the Old Men sent into Russia fragments of armies from their own lands (fragments, so that there would not be too formidable an outcry at home); and these armies were young men of the people, many of whom did not know the name of Russia, but who were nevertheless led into its wintry fastnesses, there to live in hardship and loneliness, or to perish. And so it went on for many moons, and the Old Men smiled cunningly, for they had wrought much misery and spilled a deal of human blood and loosed hatred and lust and rancor, all for the high sport of the gods.

Until the finale that brought the thunder of insane cosmic laughter. This was nought but the splendidly simple trick of the reversing by the Old Men of all that they had done. How better could they pay compliment to the gods and prove that these things had been done not on the basis of petty human logic but solely for the gods' sport? First, using now one pretext and now another, the Old Men warily withdrew their fragmentary armies. Then they whispered into the ears of the border states and into the ears of the brother fighting against brother that perhaps it would be as well (since so much had been achieved) to make peace with Russia. Then very circumspectly and discreetly they spread the tidings that Russia was not after all so bad as she had been painted, and indeed was quite decent enough to do business with, especially since it could be done on a profitable basis. Finally, after due and decorous delay,—for there must be no unseemly haste in the relief of suffering,—was exorcised the lethal magic ring where-with Russian husbands and wives and babes had been cursed.

And the Old Men gaze upward for the Olympian applause that is their due. For have they not perpetrated the most bloody, the most grim and ghastly joke the high gods have ever seen?

JOHN DAMER.

At Once!

THE following appeared in *La Vie Ouvrière* (Paris, December 19, 1919), a French Syndicalist, revolutionist, and internationalist paper.

The author, Raymond Lefebvre, vice-president of the A. R. A. C., was a private soldier throughout the war, candidate for deputy in the November elections, and co-author with Lieut. Paul Vaillant-Couturier (Legion d'Honneur, Croix de Guerre, etc.) of *La Guerre des Soldats*.

The A. R. A. C. is an International of ex-service men who are opposed to war. The organization is growing rapidly in France and has branches in other countries.

The other evening, at the Central Federated Union of Paris, a member of the A. R. A. C. (*Association Républicaine des Anciens Combattants*) told me that the fourth chapter of the Seine had passed an order of the day, according to which the members of the Republican Association of Former Soldiers pledged their honor to refuse henceforth to answer any order of mobilization, and those among them who were exempted from military service because of wounds promised to use their "glorious prestige" to dissuade young men from answering the call.

I admit that I did not give my immediate sanction to this. I saw instantly a picture of summary executions, and remembered similar threats thrown out before 1914 by the followers of Hervé; but above all, I realized that this movement was a serious matter, not to be lightly entered upon.

But after reflection, I too vote for the order of the day passed by the fourth chapter of the A. R. A. C. And I shall do all in my power to get the entire Association to pass the resolution. All the chapters of the entire country must vote for it, too, at the next congress of our Internationale.

No, this will be no repetition of the childish action of Hervé's followers. This will be a mass action, soberly agreed upon, of men matured by suffering, and who speak only whereof they know. It will be a movement methodically, painstakingly prepared; not a dilettantish conspiracy, nor yet a theatrical gesture savoring of comic opera or the movies. It will be brought about simply by propaganda. We have learned our lesson. We know that treaties, as well as guarantees and precautions intended to disarm the enemy, are nought. One thing counts, and one only: disarmament of the heart. Nothing more is needed. The refusal to answer the order of mobilization for the new war (for it is already being cooked up for us) is not dependent on the tooting of horns. It depends on literature. In season and out of season, we must keep stirring up the old wounds of war so long as there is a cannon in the world. We must do all we can to discredit patriotic manifestations. Regimental colors must be hissed. Polyeucte was quite right: idols are destroyed only by being blasphemed. Let us organize international literature as it has never been organized before. We suggest a congress of intellectuals, to the end that in all countries a concerted movement be started to discredit military service, to show it up as the absurd and repugnant thing that it is. We must make unbearable the life of any young man who talks of joining the army, must ridicule him till he renounces his purpose. In all socialist communities there must be museums and cinemas portraying the sufferings of war.

On all occasions must the emetic be administered—and before it is too late: that is to say, at once!

RAYMOND LEFEBVRE.

Ex Libris

Current Thinking : Four Examples

Man or the State, edited by W. R. Browne (B. W. Huebsch).

Untimely Papers, by Randolph Bourne (B. W. Huebsch).

The Social Problem, by Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan).

The New Social Order, by Harry F. Ward (Macmillan).

I WELL remember many years ago, while making some researches into the work of Robert Owen, being very much astonished at the volume of literature upon economics and political science which was produced in the generation following the close of the Napoleonic Wars. The bibliography of the period is enormous, and as the recent reissue of Graham Wallas' *Life of Francis Place* shows, a good deal of it is still vital and to the point. It was a time much like our own,—a period in which Europe was trying to right itself after two great upheavals, the French Revolution and a great and devastating war. The French Revolution had definitely established the principle of popular sovereignty, established it in a way which was to bring it at last into its own. The Napoleonic Wars had pretty well shattered the economic organization of Europe, which indeed was already in a very shaky condition in consequence of the Industrial Revolution; and this circumstance had brought with it a great deal of destitution among common folk. Men had in consequence to try to think out some way of deliverance. In our day the Russian Revolution has introduced a novel political principle, and the modern world is being compelled to relate itself to it; and the War has left the world, as Europe was left a century ago, in a state of widespread confusion and distress the end of which no man can yet foresee. And we in our turn have to find some way out.

And we are thinking pretty hard. The amount of political and economic literature that is pouring out of the press is enormous, on both sides of the Atlantic; and it would take one's undivided time to keep pace with it. Now as usual, the most thorough-going thinking is being done by liberal and radical minds; and presently out of this ferment will emerge the constructive philosophy which will furnish us with the ideas and methods by which the world will be set on its feet again.

Current thinking gathers around two poles, the political and the economic; and the four volumes now before us are equally divided between these two interests. The volume edited by Mr. Browne is a useful collection of noteworthy utterances on the relation of the State to the Individual. One or two of these documents are as dead as Queen Anne and were hardly worth raising from the dead. But we are glad and grateful that Mr. Browne has made this collection because there are included in it two pieces of first-rate importance: Kropotkin's essay on the historic rôle of the State, and Thoreau's famous essay on *The Duty of Civil Disobedience*. Perhaps Mr. Browne will be persuaded to give us another compilation of some of the classics of the literature of liberty,—the *Apopogica*, the *Parables d'un Croyant*, and the like.

From Thoreau to Randolph Bourne is an easy transition because both men had in common a clear vision of life and its supremacy over institutions. The death of Randolph Bourne was a first-class tragedy; and

these unfinished papers give us a good idea of the vigor and wealth of mind that was lost to us when Bourne died. These papers are overshadowed by the War; and as the War figured in Bourne's outlook as a tragic impertinence which had rudely choked the young shoots of a new life in America with which his dearest hopes were bound up, there is a steady undertow of resentment which disturbs the balance of his thought. But all the same, these papers were worth printing as a historical document to show the generations to come how the War struck a profound and honest mind that had enthroned the spirit of life and was already seeing afar off the triumph of life over the forces of death.

Mr. Ellwood's *Social Problem* is, like everything that he writes, a clear, straightforward exposition of the road before us if we are to bring some sort of ordered life out of the tangle in which we are caught. Mr. Ellwood has thought deeply and bravely into the heart of that complex of problems which we gather up in the useful 'omnibus' term, the Social Problem. He sees plainly that recovery is bound up with a new perception of spiritual and moral values, but he insists no less that these values shall be translated into the idiom of a practical polity. Mr. Ellwood has the distinction of clothing good hard thinking in simple and readable prose; and his book should be read by everyone who desires to clarify his mind upon the issues before us without having to endure the discomforts of a rain of technical jargon.

It is too late in the day to commend anything that comes from the pen of Professor Ward. This new volume is a detailed study of the immediate problem in its various aspects; and it is marked throughout by the author's characteristic conscientiousness and care. The first part of the book deals with the principles of the coming social order and the condition of its realization. The second part contains a patient exposition of the various utterances and programs that have been issued. There are several notable chapters; but the chapter on the Russian Soviet Constitution is far and away the ablest and clearest statement yet given to us upon that very important subject. Mr. Ward is to be envied for his twofold gift of grasping details and of strong speculative thinking; and this combination makes his book a singularly valuable and safe guide for the student. R. R.

The Imperialist Bludgeon in Russia

FIGHTING Without a War (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) is an account of military intervention in northern Russia by Ralph Albertson, a Y. M. C. A. secretary who served throughout the Archangel expedition. It is hard to believe that any decent American will read this brief and graphic book without hot anger, first against the cynical and ruthless British imperialism which was responsible for the Archangel adventure, and secondly, against our own government for its participation in an act of war against a friendly people. The whole affair was as utterly lacking in justification as was the German invasion of Belgium. With the reader's anger and shame will be mingled a wholesome admiration for the peasants of northern Russia and indeed for the Soviet government, which in the face of abominable British atrocities refrained from vengeance and trusted instead to propaganda. Mr. Albertson makes clear that there was almost no crime which our official propagandists attributed to the Bolsheviks that was not committed by the British.

They shot prisoners; they conscripted Russian people both for labor and for war; they imported large numbers of Chinese, dressed them in British uniforms, and trained them to fight against the Bolsheviks; they shot Bolshevik prisoners without mercy; they executed mutineers and those suspected of being on the verge of mutiny without trial; they burned villages and cared so little for popular education that they turned one schoolhouse in dark northern forests into a storage place for whiskey. All this happened months after the signing of the armistice in a country against which neither Britain nor America had declared war. It is some small consolation to one's national self-respect to read that in spite of everything Americans were liked in northern Russia and that blame for the stupidities and cruelties of the expedition fell primarily upon British officers who were usually at odds with their American comrades. There is further consolation in the fact that our troops were withdrawn months before the English. The whole story, however, makes for no national pride but rather for an undying opposition to the imperialism which for its own selfish ends took brave men from the west to make them the murderers of a great and patient people. The reading of the books helps to an understanding not only of the Russian problem but of what British imperialism—or American—always means in countries where a foreign army is in control.

Communion with Great Spirits

DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES and Mrs. Lillian Browne-Olf have performed a rare service in compiling the *Grail of Life* (Dodd, Mead & Co.) which is accurately and beautifully described in the sub-title as an Anthology of Heroic Death and Immortal Life. Their quotations cover a wide range of the literature not of one race or time but of humanity. Here are old friends and new, and if the reader wonders sometimes why certain passages are included and others that he loves omitted, he must remember that anthologies are always personal and renew his thanks to the authors for presenting him with so much valuable material from which to cull. The best criticism on the book and the best statement of its value is to be found in Dr. Holmes' own preface: "It is impossible to read however imperfect a record of man's thoughts on death and after, as written from earliest to latest times, without confessing that there is indeed an undying fire of the divine within us, and bowing in adoration before it." The book brings a note of hope and courage to a heavy-hearted world which sorely needs the comfort of communion with the great spirits whose record is the imperishable glory of mankind.

Waldo Frank Interprets America

AMERICANS who feel that the most immediate need of their country is to understand itself will welcome such a book as this of Mr. Waldo Frank's (*Our America*, by Waldo Frank. Boni and Liveright). A hundred such books would be a hundred distinct services. The truth might begin to emerge.

Mr. Frank's advantage over interpreters otherwise better equipped is that he is free of conventional clichés and prepossessions, that he makes a direct and honest approach. Furthermore, he understands that his task is an impossible one, that the unity indicated by a map of the United States is geographical merely, and that the diverse attributes of these states are by no means fused into a national personality. And if the loosely assembled chapters, with their faults of judgment and of taste, their frequent swervings into rhapsody, reveal that Mr. Frank has not the temperament

of the critic, they prove also that he has the lusty courage and confidence of the pilgrim whom you can count upon to have adventure. Adventure in fact he has, and his probably dissenting reader with him, as soon as he seizes upon those well-worn words, Puritan and Pioneer. The very energy that he applies to analyzing the root of American culture stimulates him to a fever of paradox in which he reproaches the Puritan colonist for whatever love of money and of power present-day America may be guilty of. "The Puritan movement was simply a chapter in the long history of religious decadence. . . . It was essentially an irreligious force; it was in practice a component of pioneering. . . ." "The Puritan . . . spoke about Creed; he meant dominion. He thought it was because of God that he left England; but what he found across the sea was Empire."

An unadmirable figure to start with, as Mr. Frank sees him, the Puritan further corrupted himself by repressing all natural, wholesome impulses that might impede the enterprise of pioneering. Any cultural progress worth mentioning was thus sacrificed and in Mr. Frank's belief is still sacrificed by the typical American because of his inherited pioneer-urge. "Psychologically," he ingeniously maintains, the American "is still moving westward." And New England, special heir to the unlovely traits of the first settlers, has done worse. It has hypocritically practiced the "Emersonian escape." Having no actual concern with spiritual values, the New Englander accepted transcendentalism, and Emerson, for the very reason that they needn't be reconciled with his everyday interests. "The oversoul of Emerson gave to a material world the very dualism it required."

From such harsh generalizations the author does, however, naively exempt an entire generation,—that of his own coevals. "Ours is the first generation of Americans consciously engaged in spiritual pioneering. . . . The homes of our childhood were still the homes of a people given up in thought and dream and action to the impulses of material discovery. Cultural America in 1900 was an untracked wilderness but dimly blazed by the heroic ax of Whitman. As the first pioneers who struck across the continent were men unorganized and isolate, so are we."

But in general it is possible to follow Mr. Frank much more seriously as a reporter of present-day conditions than as a historian. He usefully sets forth facts concerning the corrupted press of this country, the educational machine, the economic and industrial status. He points out that far from having achieved social integration, "the traditional democracy of the United States is a disguised ideal of the herd." "Nervous, hypersensitive, in response to the disturbance that menaces it as a whole, deaf to the fate of individual components. A true herd reaction." The book has a genuinely interesting chapter on the Jew and much that is just and sympathetic in regard to the "buried culture" of the Indian. But the unburied issues that cluster about the Negro it notably fails to mention. And with the exception of an elaborate eulogy of Miss Amy Lowell, there is no intimation that the American population is not exclusively masculine.

Any sincere discussion of our present civilization must have many maladies to chronicle, many lamentable tendencies. Yet the conclusion of this discussion is, to use the favorite American term, "optimistic." The author foresees a "turning of the soil" which to him means a religious renaissance. His final word is: "We must begin to generate within ourselves the energy which is love of life. For that energy, to whatever form the mind consigns it, is religious. Its act is creation. And in a dying world, creation is revolution."

The Last Page

I WISH SOME WAY COULD BE DEvised BY WHICH we might hear more often and more adequately how minority opinion in foreign countries is shaping and expressing itself. This is no idle matter, for in these days minorities sometimes turn into very powerful majorities overnight, and we should do well to be informed of their beginnings. Not even from England, where no barrier of language holds us apart, do we get more than an occasional glimpse of the splendid, generous, internationally-minded people who so bravely keep the flag of humanity flying in the midst of the present welter of nationalism, militarism, and imperialism. Take for instance the crowded meeting of protest which was held in London recently against the massacre at Armtisar. A leading labor member of parliament took the chair and the speakers included Commander Kenworthy, M. P., the Rev. Dr. Orchard, Miss Maude Royden, and Mr. B. G. Homan, the late editor of the *Bombay Chronicle*, who was deported from India on account of his openly expressed sympathy with the Nationalist cause.

SOME TIME AGO ON THIS PAGE THE TRIAL OF THE five Socialist members of the New York State Legislature was likened, appropriately enough, to the crazy trial of the Mouse in Alice's Wonderland. But there is another classic story of a dream that gives an even closer parallel to the folly and crime at Albany. Those who know the enduring fascination of "The Pilgrim's Progress" will remember what befell Christian and Faithful in Vanity Fair. Let me recall the outlines of the story in the rough homespun of Bunyan's own words:

"Then a convenient time being appointed, they brought them forth to their Tryal, in order to their condemnation. When the time was come, they were brought before their enemies, and arraigned. The Judge's name was Lord Hategood. Their Indictment was one and the same in substance, though somewhat varying in form, the contents whereof was this:

"That they were enemies to and disturbers of their Trade that they had made Commotions and Divisions in the Town, and had won a party to their own most dangerous Opinions in contempt of the Law of their Prince. . . . Then Faithful began to answer.

"As for Disturbance, said he, I make none, being myself a man of Peace the parties that were won to us, were won by beholding our Truth and Innocence. . . .

"Then Proclamation was made, that they that had ought to say against the Prisoner at the Bar, should forthwith appear and give in their evidence. So there came in three witnesses, to wit, Envy, Superstition, and Pickthank [one who tries to 'pick up thanks' by means of flattery and sycophancy]. . . .

"Then stood forth Envy, and said to this effect: . . . This man is one of the vilest men in our Country. He neither regarded Prince nor People, Law nor Custom; but doth all that he can to possess all men with certain of his disloyal notions. . . . And in particular, I heard him once myself affirm, That Christianity and the Customs of our Town of Vanity were diametrically opposite, and could not be reconciled. By which saying, my Lord, he doth at once not only condemn all our laudable doings, but us in the doing of them. . . .

"Then they called Superstition . . . I have no great acquaintance with this man, so he began; nor do I desire to have further knowledge of him; how-

ever, this I know, that he is a very pestilent fellow, from some discourse that the other day I had with him in this Town. . . .

"Then Was Pickthank sworn, and bid say what he knew in behalf of their Lord the King. . . .

"This fellow I have known of a long time, and have heard him speak things that ought not to be spoke; for he hath railed on our noble Prince Beelzebub, and hath spoken contemptibly of his honorable Friends, whose names are the Lord Old Man, the Lord Carnal Delight, the Lord Luxurious, the Lord Desire of Vain Glory, my old Lord Lechery, Sir Having Greedy, with all the rest of our Nobility, and he hath said moreover, that if all men were of his mind, if possible, there is not one of these Noblemen should have any longer a being in this Town. . . . When this Pickthank had told his tale, the Judge directed his speech to the Prisoner at the Bar, saying, Thou Runagate, Heretick, and Traitor, hast thou heard what these honest Gentlemen have witnessed against thee?

"FAITH: May I speak a few words in my own defense?

"JUDGE: Sirrah, sirrah, thou deservest to live no longer, but to be slain immediately upon the place; yet that all Men may see our gentleness toward thee, let us see what thou hast to say.

"FAITH: I say then if I have said amiss convince me of my error, and I am ready here before you to make my recantation. . . .

"Then the Judge called to the Jury (who all this while stood by, to hear and observe), Gentlemen of the Jury, you see this man about whom so great an uproar hath been made in this Town; you have also heard what these worthy Gentlemen have witnessed against him: also you have heard his reply and confession. It lieth now in your breasts to hang him, or save his life; but yet I think meet to instruct you into our Law. There was an Act made in the days of Pharaoh the Great, that lest those of a contrary Religion should multiply and grow too strong for him, their Males should be thrown into the river. There was also an Act made in the days of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, that whoever would not fall down and worship his Golden Image, should be thrown into a Fiery Furnace. There was also an Act made in the days of Darius, that whoso, for some time, called upon any God but him, should be cast into the Lions' Den. Now the substance of these Laws this Rebel has broken, not only in thought (which is not to be borne), but also in word and deed; which must therefore needs be intollerable. For that of Pharaoh, his Law was made upon a supposition, to prevent mischief, no Crime being yet apparent; but here is a Crime apparent. For the second and third, you see he disputeth against our Religion; and for the Treason he hath confessed, he deserveth to die the death.

"Then went the Jury out, whose names were, Mr. Blind-man, Mr. No-good, Mr. Malice, Mr. Love-lust, Mr. Live-loose, Mr. Heady, Mr. High-mind, Mr. Enmity, Mr. Liar, Mr. Cruelty, Mr. Hate-light, and Mr. Implacable; who every one gave in his private Verdict against him among themselves, and afterwards unanimously concluded to bring him in guilty before the Judge. . . . And so they did; therefore he was presently condemned to be had from the place where he was, to the place from whence he came, and there to be put to the most cruel death that could be invented. . . ."

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Man or the State, Edited by Waldo R. Browne (B. W. Huebsch).....	\$1.00
Untimely Papers, Randolph Bourne (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.50
The Social Problem, Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan).....	1.75
The New Social Order, Harry F. Ward (Macmillan).....	2.50
Our America, Waldo Frank (Boni & Liveright).....	2.00
The Grail of Life, John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.).....	2.00
Fighting Without a War, Ralph Albertson (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
Socialism in Thought and Action, Harry W. Laidler (Macmillan).....	2.50
Liberty and the News, Walter Lippman (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
The Brass Check, Upton Sinclair.....	.50
The Opium Monopoly, Ellen N. La Motte (Macmillan).....	1.00
Debs: His Authorized Life and Letters, David Karsner (Boni & Liveright).....	1.50
The Soul of the Russian Revolution, Moissaye J. Olgin (Henry Holt & Co.).....	2.75
Russia in Upheaval, E. A. Ross (Century Co.).....	2.50
The Red Heart of Russia, Bessie Beatty (Century Co.).....	2.00
Ten Days That Shook the World, John Reed (Boni & Liveright).....	2.00
Lenin, Albert Rhys Williams (Scott & Seltzer).....	1.50
Russia in 1919, Arthur Ransome (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.50
Germany and Russia at Brest-Litovsk, Judah L. Magnes (Rand School).....	1.00
The Bullitt Mission, William C. Bullitt (B. W. Huebsch), paper, 50c. cloth.....	1.00
Bolshevism, John Spargo (Harper).....	1.75
The Russian Pendulum, Arthur Bullard (Macmillan).....	2.00
The Plot Against Mexico, J. L. de Bekker (Alfred A. Knopf).....	2.00
Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children (Scribner).....	2.50

COMBINATION OFFERS

THE WORLD TOMORROW (one dollar a year) with

The Nation (weekly).....	\$5.55 saving .75
The Survey (weekly).....	4.55 saving .75
The Socialist Review (monthly).....	5.15 saving .75
The Irish Free (weekly).....	5.80 saving .75
Good Morning (Art Young's new illustrated weekly).....	5.55 saving .80
Young India (Monthly).....	1.75 saving .75

Canadian subscription to THE WORLD TOMORROW, \$1.15 a year; Foreign, \$1.55.

Don't forget to send us the names and addresses of any friends who are likely to be interested in THE WORLD TOMORROW.

WANTED: A Young Man to teach common school subjects, manual training, athletics to boys who are learning to be civil to themselves and to society. Address
THE CHICAGO JUNIOR HOME AND FARM SCHOOL FOR BOYS
ST. JOSEPH, MICHIGAN

THE MOLLY BEST STORIES

"Miss Best's stories are rich material, fresh from life, illustrating amazingly the amazing wisdom of the people, the so-called ignorant people. They make the so-called educated laugh, but the laugh is on the laugher."—*Isabel Steffen*. "Her mimicry of dialect is exquisite, not too broad or professional."—*William James*.

For terms and dates write

MISS MARY AGNES BEST

Caldwell, N. J.

SOCIALISM IN THOUGHT AND ACTION

By HARRY W. LAIDLER

Secretary, Intercollegiate Socialist Society

The most up-to-date statement of the aims and methods of Socialism, including what it is doing and what it has done in Europe and America.

\$2.50 net. Postpaid, \$2.70. Excess postage if any will be returned.

Order through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 6

JUNE, 1920

10 Cents

What of Japan?

A View from Within

The Balkan Tangle

By R. H. Markham

Can a Christian be Neutral?

By Norman Thomas

The Strike

A Symposium by

John Haynes Holmes Upton Sinclair

James H. Maurer Roger W. Babson

Evan Thomas

The Fellowship Press, Inc.

118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the June Issue

	PAGE
What of Japan? A View from Within	163
Signs of the Times.....	166
Can a Christian Be Neutral? by Norman Thomas	170
The Balkan Tangle, by R. H. Markham	172
The Strike, a Symposium by John Haynes Holmes, James H. Maurer, Upton Sinclair, Roger W. Babson, Evan Thomas	174
A Visit to the Home of Tagore, by Edmund B. Chaffee.....	178
Turning the Tables on the Government, by Mary Agnes Best.....	180
The French Woman and the Home, by Mary Kelsey.....	183
Open for Discussion.....	186
Ex Libris	188
The Last Page, by the Ex-Proof-reader	190

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. June, 1920. No. 6

Published by
The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
118 East 28th St., New York.
Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer;
John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD
TOMORROW: Norman Thomas,
Editor; Gove Hambidge, Assistant
Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin,
Edward W. Evans, Walter G.
Fuller, John Haynes Holmes,
Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown
Leach, John Howard Melish,
Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence,
Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F.
Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price ten cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.00; Canada \$1.15; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.25. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

R. H. MARKHAM has been engaged for six years in missionary and educational work in Bulgaria.
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE is now returning from two years' service with the American Red Cross in the Near East.
MARY KELSEY for more than a year was a member of the Friends Unit in France.
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES is well known as minister and author.
JAMES H. MAURER is President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor.
UPTON SINCLAIR is an author and journalist.
ROGER W. BABSON is a statistical expert of national reputation.
EVAN THOMAS, an absolutist conscientious objector during the war, is now Secretary of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in Paterson.
MARY AGNES BEST, formerly on the staff of the American Magazine, is well known for her artistic iconoclasm.
In next month's issue will appear further discussion on the problem of the strike and an article on the subject, "Is Labor Responsible for the High Cost of Living?"

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF THE WORLD TOMORROW, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1920.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Norman Thomas, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of the World Tomorrow and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, The Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 East 28th Street, New York City; Editor, Norman Thomas, 118 East 28th Street, New York City; Managing Editor, Norman Thomas, 118 East 28th Street, New York City; Business Managers, None.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of stock.)

The Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 East 28th Street, New York City; Agnes Brown Leach, 170 East 64th Street, New York City; John Nevin Sayre, Katomoh, New York; Paul Furnas, 501 Fifth Avenue, New York City; L. Hollingsworth Wood, 20 Nassau Street, New York City; Norman Thomas, 118 East 28th Street, New York City; Gilbert A. Beaver, 118 East 28th Street, New York City.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

NORMAN THOMAS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this thirty-first day of March, 1920.

[SEAL]

HENRY HAUSMANN.

My commission expires March 30, 1921.

COMBINATION OFFERS

THE WORLD TOMORROW (one dollar a year) with

The Nation (weekly).....	\$5.10 saving 6.75
The Survey (weekly).....	4.35 saving .75
The Socialist Review (monthly).....	5.75 saving .75
The Irish Press (weekly).....	2.50 saving .70
Good Morning (Art Young's new Illustrated weekly).....	2.50 saving .50
Young India (monthly).....	1.75 saving .75

These offers are good until June 1, when the price of THE WORLD TOMORROW will be \$1.50 a year.
Canadian subscription to THE WORLD TOMORROW, \$1.15 a year; Foreign, \$1.25.
Don't forget to send us the names and addresses of any friends who are likely to be interested in THE WORLD TOMORROW.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 6

JUNE, 1920

10 Cents

What of Japan?

A View from Within

FOR reasons that will be obvious the author of this article wishes to remain anonymous. He is personally known to us and we have confidence in his judgment. At the same time, let us reiterate editorially the caution he himself gives: that no one man can present the whole truth about a nation—least of all, perhaps, Japan, so little understood in the Occident. Many of the statements herein made would be "meat" for the yellow-peril agitator. That the author is far from entertaining the yellow-peril bogey will be made more clear in the second half of the article, which will appear in our July issue, and in which the author shows that not in preparation for strife but in larger understanding and a closer approximation to the principles of Christianity lies the solution of the Japanese problem. Meanwhile it behooves us to remember the sins of our own civilization. Only as we conquer them can we aid the Japanese movement toward democracy.

I

JAPAN is today a nation of contrasts and paradoxes. It cannot be explained by any cut and dried theory. In fact, no one is qualified to explain the currents of life in this nation. Each of us sees his little part and makes his deductions, but when all is said and done the whole remains an enigma. So what is written here cannot be the last word, or even the first.

American opinion and information regarding Japan is equally confused. There seem to be two principal forces working on American public opinion: the anti-Japanese agitators who usually have race hatred and jealousy as their motives and overlook such real wrongs on Japan's part as her blatant militarism and imperialism in Asia; and on the other hand the insidious pro-Japanese propaganda, often skilfully done, sometimes clumsy—but always ready with an explanation for everything that might make America uneasy about the methods or purposes of her Western neighbor. Between these two extremes it is hard to find an accurate, fair mean. For the man who tours Japan and comes home to

write "authoritative" books sees just what he is intended to see—no more; while the man who has lived long in Japan and who thinks of going back knows that everything he says will be waiting for him when he gets to Japan and so often prefers to remain silent about vital issues. If he does say anything good about Japan, the propagandists twist it and fit it to their case; or should he candidly state the other side, the anti-Japanese agitators pounce with avidity upon everything that will add fuel to their fires.

Both anti-Japanese and pro-Japanese factions are wrong. Nor has the writer a final truth to put in their place. For both anti- and pro- are also right. It is the truth in each case that gives "punch" and permits the distortions to take to themselves plausibility. Japan is an imperialistic, militaristic, aggressive, selfish, autocratic power—a menace to the peace of the world and a living mockery of Justice and Righteousness and world fraternity. But in the same breath one must say that Japan is being thrilled to its foundations by a powerful, though unspectacular, movement toward democracy. The question for the rest of the world resolves itself into something like this: "Will Japan gain the mastery over herself and become a world blessing before the military elements have made her another great scourge of mankind?"

MILITARISTS ENTRENCHED BEHIND THE EMPEROR

Were the military power subordinated to the civil authority, and had the people a voice in the government, it is safe to say that the ideals of a better world are strong enough in the minds of Japan's people to make her automatically safe for the rest of the nations. But the fact remains that the military, seeing the oncoming wave of democracy, some time ago had themselves made directly responsible to the Emperor, not to the Premier or Cabinet or legislative bodies. In this way they have managed to turn criticism of themselves or their imperialistic policies into the crime of *lèse-majesté*. That is a more serious crime in Japan than anywhere else because of the power of Shinto, the re-

ligion of state worship, which keeps the people in an attitude of worship toward the Imperial House. Japan needs a new Restoration—a new set of true patriots who can save her beloved Emperor from the military schemers.

For Japan's people want their Emperor. One reason they are slow to democratize their life is the fear that it will involve a revolution directed against the Emperor. When they find a way to keep their Emperor in his place and still carry out democratic reforms and gain popular control over the Government and military, it is safe to say they will speedily follow that way. No one can blame them for being proud of their ruling dynasty. It is the oldest dynasty in the world—traditionally it was founded by the Emperor Jimmu in 660 B. C., and from its founder the Japanese people are said to be descended. So Japan's ties to her ruler are not like the ties of force that bound the Chinese to the conquering Manchus, but are more vital and living. The military powers that have taken advantage of this situation and have forced the revision of histories, the control of publications, and the installing of shrines galore to enhance the position of the Emperor in the eyes of the people. Incidentally, they have used this glorification of the Emperor to put themselves beyond the reach of criticism or control, where they can even sneer at the diplomatic obligations incurred by the civil branch of the Government.

The most powerful instrument for keeping themselves in power is the militarists' control over the sources of popular information and the way in which Japan's educational system fits into their schemes. Perhaps no other nation furnishes such a fertile field for false education of the public as does Japan. Japan's language and writing are a barrier between herself and other nations that is not lightly crossed. Japanese newspapers and magazines may say what they wish, and the rest of the world will know only what some charitably (or maliciously!) inclined person translates for them. As at present, Japanese abroad may make a tremendous bid for American favor, while newspapers at home carry on a virulent and utterly false anti-American campaign—which the people believe because it is all they get. Even when some studious Occidental does make himself master of the character and idiom, unless he has been brought up as a Japanese from childhood the subtle allusions of much that is written will escape him. A character that calls to mind a pat quotation from Confucius; a word that calls up an old poem learned in childhood—and lo, the passage that is perfectly innocent in English is fraught with meaning to its Japanese reader. A Japanese whom the writer can fully trust assures him that this method is used far more than any foreigner realizes, and that the real venom of the militarists' poisoned press lies here.

EDUCATION THAT DOES NOT EDUCATE

Now add to this situation the way in which much of the outside world is a closed book to the mass of Japanese and you see what the control of the press and publications means to the militarists. It is widely circulated by Japanese propagandists that Japan is a well-educated nation, with one of the highest literacy percentages in the world, and with ninety-eight per cent. of the children of school age in school. Next time you meet the man who recites that tale, ask him some questions and see if he says it deliberately or innocently. On the face of them, these statistics are true; but never take the Orient at its face value. Even the Orient itself is offended at such simplicity! Unregistered children cannot attend school. Of course not: things not on police records in Japan simply do not exist. And the poorer classes, often dispensing with formal marriage, do not regularly register their children. This creates a class that, being non-existent, needs no education and still is useful in industry. But those who are registered and do go to school: what of them? First, in some mysterious manner, apprentices are everywhere. The children are all in school, of course, but there is no shortage of apprentices. And in the six years of compulsory schooling, for those who are actually in school, little can be learned besides Chinese characters. In the time that an Occidental child is learning much about geography, arithmetic, history, and other general subjects, the Japanese child is simply mastering the means of reading and writing and simple calculations on the *soroban*, the ancient adding-machine of the Orient. Not till the seventh year of school (only six years' schooling can be had by the great majority, even if they want more) is any foreign geography taught. The school readers contain only one reference (and that uncomplimentary) to any foreign country throughout the first seven books. That reference is to a conquest of Korea by an old-time Japanese hero! Small wonder that for narrow, ignorant, bigoted, and concealed nationalism, trimmed with arrogance, the normal Japanese has scarce an equal throughout the world. The people are taught to read, but their news diet is carefully regulated to their "needs."

HOW THE PEOPLE BACK THE AUTOCRACY

Thus in Japan we have not a selfish upper class ruling a really free-hearted nation with a ruthless hand, as Germany has been pictured to us. The selfish militaristic upper class is there, no mistake; but they are part and parcel of the whole nation. The mass of the people, despite a powerful democratic movement, are still back of the imperialists. It is the backing of ignorance, but no less real. Worst of all, the ignorance is planned. The people may not be morally blameable for backing militarism, but their backing is whole-hearted.

One who watches present-day democratic tendencies may question that statement. But it seems safe to say that while militarism is increasingly in discredit it is still in power and is there because the people do not yet hate it enough to remove it. Some day they may come to that state of illumination, but while they are rapidly nearing it, they are not yet there. Even as in the Germany of 1913 liberal, anti-militaristic forces were strong, but not strong enough to stand out against the current, so they are now strong in Japan, but not yet with the strength that changes nations.

Of course the whole autocracy is inextricably bound up with great masses of capital, exploitation at home and abroad, and a subsidized foreign trade that makes millionaires, but sucks the life-blood of the nation through its high prices at home to pay for cheap selling abroad. Japan is not alone there, but her capitalists and war-lords are not restrained even by a tacit acknowledgment of the principles that we call Christian, and so fear neither God nor devil.

THE "AMERICAN PERIL" IN JAPAN

What does this military autocracy propose to do with its power? Read McLaren's *Political History of Japan During the Meiji Era* and remember his statement in the preface to the effect that Japan has one consistent foreign policy—territorial expansion on the continent of Asia. Study the map and the political journals published in the Far East and see how consistently she has carried out that policy. If this be her policy, then why all the studied agitation of the militarists against America? Why do the middle-school boys in the country inform one that they are learning English that they may run America when they have conquered her, and why do they look forward to the day when rich, proud America will beg in vain for mercy? Are the autocrats foolish enough to think that they can conquer America?

Not for a moment. They want to avoid war with America at all costs. But they know that China has one friend—not an entirely consistent friend, but one who has stood by her in times of need and who may stand by her again some day. They have lately discovered that Siberia has a friend, too, and they live in no small apprehension lest "meddlesome America" become roused over some of their activities and call a halt in thunderous tones. Consequently it pays to keep the popular mind full of resentment against America, and it fits into the scheme perfectly to do this by means of false accusations against the Americans in Korea and China, circulated untiringly in the Japanese press. So if a war ever does come, the people will be ready to fight with all the earnestness and enthusiasm of those fighting in a just cause.

The big, significant fact is that the people have to be continually stirred up and prodded on to hate

America. If left to themselves and allowed to have the news of the world, they would soon be so pro-American that the "peculiar genius" of Japan would be nowhere in comparison. Of course that feeling is charged to "paid propagandists" of America, who are painted as spies and agents of capital. These "secret agents" are none other than the missionaries! The militarists are right that the popular friendliness for America is the work of the missionaries, but just as the police-military type of mind the world over can see no unselfish motive in anything, so Japan's lords of coercion also fail to see what the missionary enterprise is for.

Consequently the Japanese hears all about every little inconsistency or imagined inconsistency of America: which is of course supposed to be a solidly Christian nation in profession. There is no small agitation in Japan for "forcing America to return to Mexico the conquered provinces of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, etc." Cuba, Hawaii, and the Philippines are painted as victims of the worst kind of oppression; the facts about Korea meanwhile being scrupulously withheld. Even the liberals feel that it is easiest to go with the current, and make capital out of America's false democracy. The best and finest of them do not stoop to such tactics, of course, although such men often know far more of how cruelly we fall short of Democracy; but because their moral judgments are sincere they judge their own country first and others later, as true men do throughout the world. The host of condemning voices, reveling in revilement of America, represents no true moral judgment, for such honesty of purpose would show itself in condemnation of Japan's own rotten life and in constructive effort to better affairs.

One more part of the dark side of the picture must be indicated before we pass to the constructive side: that is the absence of moral feeling or action in Japan, and the unspeakable filth that lies beneath her dainty surface. The truth about Japan's sexual immorality could not be printed; nor would much of it be believed in America. In western nations, Christianity, though an apparent failure in some spheres, leaves its unrecognized impress everywhere. People shun the moral leper—concubines are not in fashion openly—honesty is regarded as fundamental—people believe right is right, even when they fall short of living up to this consciousness. But Christian morality, even in its narrowest personal sense, is sneered at in Japan. What this means can be learned only by seeing. Out of this wallow of selfishness and wrong can come no good. *The wallow must be cleaned first. Democracy cannot build on rotten foundations.*

THE BRIGHTER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

But there are forces working for cleanliness and for real constructive advance. They are increas-

ingly powerful and they will one day triumph. Whether we of the present generation will live to see them triumph depends largely upon how seriously we make Japan's problems our own burden, and help to strengthen those minorities who stand for righteousness. Minorities they may be, but the right and God stand with them and one day they must triumph.

Foremost stands the Christian religion. Christianity has not yet "taken hold" in Japan. It often seems like a powerful auto on a muddy road, with spinning rear wheels but little progress. Mission work has been active for fifty years, and when we look at the results only now appearing in countries which have been preached to and labored with for double that time, we take new hope, knowing that some day Christianity will "take hold" and make a better Japan. There is a widespread feel-

ing among the missionaries that new methods are needed. Some men of vision see that new purposes must come first, and the social approach to the religion of the Father God is gaining steadily in favor.

But even the narrower individual type of Christianity can point to worthy results for which it need feel no shame. In a non-Christian (or perhaps more appropriately, *anti-Christian*) land, the full application of Christianity to social problems can come only when enough people have been reached personally, patiently, as individuals, and filled with a living, loving Christian zeal that will reach out spontaneously to the social order. Social progress comes through individual enlightenment and salvation in the last analysis, especially if "salvation" be divested of its theological and emotional flavor and taken at its face meaning.

Signs of the Times

Governor Smith and the Lusk Bills

Governor Smith's public hearing on the Fearon and Lusk bills in the Assembly Chamber at Albany was the occasion of a really heartening demonstration of common sense and political liberalism. It is confidently expected that the Governor will veto the bills which provide for the outlawing of the Socialist Party and the erection of an elaborate system (1) for legalizing star-chamber proceedings in the hunt for sedition and (2) for repressive control over schools and teachers. The correspondent of no less conservative a paper than the *New York Sun* comments thus on the Governor's hearing:

"Labor, churches, the bar associations, political organizations and scores of civic associations lined up with the Socialist Party and its leaders in denouncing the proposals as tyrannical and repressive. Not in years has there been such united and whole-hearted denunciation of bills passed by the Legislature."

The vetoing of these bills will rank with the *Loeb corpus* proceedings in Judge Anderson's court in Boston and the courage Assistant Secretary of Labor Post has recently been showing in the deportation cases as the most hopeful signs in American official life.

Mr. Palmer, Inciter of Violence

There is a classical story of a Boston mother who on leaving her large family of children "to mind themselves" exhorted them under no circumstances to put beans up their noses. On her return she found every chick and child gasping for breath. They had found the beans. Attorney General Palmer must be ignorant of this tale which

taught the danger of social suggestion long before our psychologists arose. His sensational warnings of assassinations and riots on May Day were extraordinarily dangerous. Any student of the power of suggestion could have told him that he ran the risk of inciting unstable minds to the very acts he sought to avoid. At the same time, no newspaper pronunciamento could have deterred determined assassins. It is all very well to try to discredit radicals of every stamp by sensational and unproved charges. For a time it fools the public and discredits the radicals, but at the last it does harm and only harm. The sober truth is that if America really comes to violent revolution the authors of the violence will be Government officials, newspapers, oppressive employers and police officers. You cannot repeat over and over again that all revolutionary change means violence without persuading the workers that there is no other way. You cannot resort to the sheer brutality of raids, arrests, and deportations without arousing a spirit of revenge. On the whole, the restraint of the workers is marvelous. But it will be a miracle if *agents provocateurs*, police and industrial spies, search and arrests without warrant, mob violence, the cruelty of our prisons, the repression of opinion, the denial of the freedom of assembly, speech, and the press, and the right to organize and to strike, do not prove to be the wind from which the whirlwind will be reaped. Thanks to Secretary Post and Judge Anderson we have official knowledge of the shameful tactics of the Department of Justice, but not even these proceedings have brought out more than a tittle of the truth. For instance, we were told the other day how certain alleged anarchists were scientifically beaten by agents of the Department of

Justice in order to make them sign confessions on which they could be deported. There is a way of beating men so that bruises are not left, and the word of the prisoner is never taken against the denial of the officer. Yet there is but little doubt of the truth. Already some of the men who make this complaint have been discharged because not even by these tactics could the Government support its case. Out of the accumulated evidence one fact is significant. Assistant Secretary Post says that in five thousand cases of arrest only three firearms were found, and two of these were revolvers of small caliber. A singular record for revolutionists intent upon the immediate armed destruction of the social order!

The Mogul of Duquesne

DUQUESNE, Pa., has a great Pooh-bah. His name is James S. Crawford. He is Mayor, president of the local bank, brother of the manager of the steel mills, owner of most of the vacant lots in town. He is also author of an anti-free-speech ordinance under which he has kept every labor organizer from speaking anywhere in Duquesne. On a Sunday afternoon in May five labor men connected with the Steel Workers Committee and the Rev. W. M. Fincke, founder of Brookwood School and representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, put matters to a test. Having unsuccessfully applied for a permit, they attempted to hold an outdoor meeting with an automobile as a platform. Mr. Fincke began and was promptly arrested. So were each of the others in turn. State constabulary and local police dispersed the crowd. Next morning Mayor Crawford, author of the law, who as mayor ignored requests for a permit and directed the dispersal of the meeting, sitting now as magistrate gave the prisoners before him their choice of a one-hundred-dollar fine or thirty days in jail. They took jail and stayed there till Thursday, when their lawyers arranged with a higher court for bail pending appeal. Representatives of the steel workers and the Civil Liberties Union will fight the case to the Supreme Court in an effort to vindicate the constitutional rights of free speech and assemblage. It remains to be seen whether the steel trust and their local henchmen can continue to get away with their Czaristic policy in the mill towns. Fortunately, there is liberal sentiment in Pittsburgh which is rallying to this struggle to keep open the channels of discussion and peaceable industrial action. This is the alternative to violence.

What of the Beam in Our Own Eye?

THE papers are beginning again to present dark pictures of Russia's condition, some of them based on alleged Soviet reports. Certain of these newspaper stories, e. g., parts of Colonel Ryan's statement, run counter to the testimony of such observers as Colonel Malone, Professor Goode, Isaac Don Levine, Isaac McBride, George Lansbury, Lin-

coln Eyre, and others, and are to be discredited. But granting that staggering problems face Russia, it is doubtful whether their difficulties are in reality greater than so well informed an observer as Robert Dell reports in France; while in Russia are enormously hopeful elements as yet lacking in the latter country.

The truth is that all nations, even our own, are paying for the war. Here, for instance, are our railroads pleading for a \$500,000,000 government loan and a twenty-eight per cent increase in freight rates. The shortage in freight cars alone is put at 228,000. The same issue of the *New York Times* which published this plea of the railroad executives carried a story of the terrible disorganization of transportation in Russia which proved "the failure of the Soviet economic and industrial program." Consider the facts. The United States is an industrial country enormously rich. She was in the war eighteen months and her territories were never invaded. Railway capital has been tenderly protected by guaranteed dividends; there has been no Soviet control; yet our railways claim they have "neither cash, credit, nor adequate equipment" to move freight. "A curtailment in production" is consequently in sight.

Russia is primarily an agricultural country. Her railroads were notoriously mismanaged under the Czar, especially during the war. She has had continuous war, most of it on her own territories, for nearly six years. She has been blockaded for more than two years. If the breakdown of her railway system argues the failure of Soviet rule, what shall be said of the plight of our own?

Imperialism by Aeroplane

MARSHAL FOCH says that to enforce the Turkish treaty will require 300,000 men. The people neither of Britain nor of France will put any such armies in the Near East. In consequence, there has arisen an extraordinary dependence of French and British imperialism upon conscript or mercenary troops drawn not from the homeland but from foreign colonies. England is policing her Near Eastern possessions principally with Hindu troops, themselves subject to the imperial yoke. France relies on her African soldiers, and in Asia Minor has used Armenians, thereby provoking fresh massacres of Armenians in Turkish territories. This kind of military power is no sure basis for empire, and were it not for one circumstance the grip of the white imperialisms upon the East would be precarious to the last degree. That circumstance is the aeroplane. The arms and armor of the Spanish conquerors gave them scarcely greater advantage over the bronze weapons of the Incas than bombing-planes give to those who own them over those who have none. It is an advantage which has been ruthlessly used. And since these air raiders are no longer "Huns" but God's agents of civilization, the American press and pulpit hold their peace.

For Armenia—Sympathy

THE tragedy of the Turkish situation is the plight of the Armenians. They have the sympathy of the world, but that is all. The so-called independent state of Armenia consists only of what was formerly Russian Armenia. Now that the Soviet forces have retaken the old Russian Trans-Caucasus and captured Baku with its oil fields, there are reports that Armenia and its Moslem neighbor, Azerbaijan (wherein lie the Baku oil fields) are establishing Soviet Governments and preparing to become part of a federated Russia. Other reports assert that Azerbaijan is about to attack Armenia with British guns purchased from Lloyd George's ex-protégé, Denikin. American military officials apparently take a grave view of Bolshevik and other dangers in Armenia and the rest of the Trans-Caucasus. They themselves have withdrawn and have ordered the women relief workers to leave. The men civilian relief workers remain and are inclined to minimize the danger. Under the circumstances the one best hope is that Azerbaijan jingoes will be restrained and that both the little Republics will federate peacefully with Soviet Russia.

Turkish Armenia is mostly under the control of Mustapha Kemal. Were he out of the way, the request of the powers that President Wilson define the boundaries of Armenia would still be a piece of clever but insincere diplomacy, for France claims a mandate over provinces admittedly essential to a vigorous Armenian state. Lloyd George piously tells the House of Commons how great are the burdens of France, Italy, and England "in the civilizing of these vast areas"—Mesopotamia, Cilicia, etc. They cannot aid the Armenians, who must look to America, a country which as yet has done nothing for the protection "of these poor Christian populations." Nothing, that is but try—not as generously as she ought—to feed them while the British went prospecting for oil. Britain backed Denikin, Britain today garrisons Constantinople and Batoum and polices Mesopotamia. But she has no help to spare for Armenia. The reason is plain. Armenia proper has as yet no oil wells. Her neighbors have territories flowing with oil. So the great powers give sympathy to Armenia and protection to petroleum. Will not this always be the case so long as capitalistic imperialism endures? No American mandate can save an attenuated Armenia from intrigue. Nevertheless to all the Near East we can give help through education, food and moral pressure which perhaps the Turkish nationalists—enlightened enough to have appointed a woman minister of education—will not reject.

The Mexican Army Stages a Revolution

THE anti-Carranza revolution which began in Sonora has won an easy victory. The victors claim Carranza meant to secure by fair means or foul the election of Senor Bonillas, former Amba-

sador to the United States, as his successor. He would then remain the power behind the throne. Partisans of General Obregon were therefore reluctantly compelled to resort to a revolution in order to assure themselves of a fair election! So much for the claim. Actually, the revolution seems to have been an army affair. Carranza was a civilian and a martinet, unpopular with the soldiers, who adored Obregon. The Carranza government had made headway and accomplished real reforms, but Carranza himself was not a popular hero, and he had not sufficiently bettered the lot of the peons to win their warm loyalty. So he fell a victim to the army. General Obregon, the real leader of the revolution, is pretty sure to be elected president. The provisional government under de la Huerta will see to that. American oil and other financial interests favor Obregon both as more conservative and more amenable than Carranza. Besides, they may be able to name the terms on which the United States will recognize him. It is doubtful, however, whether any President can long keep the support of both the Mexicans and the oil magnates. The fight against intervention will still be with us. There is comfort in the fact that the issue is not yet acute. There is still time to educate the people in the danger of making Mexico safe for the oil interests and the possibility of extending her genuine help.

Poland's Inexcusable War

ABOUT the end of March the Poles and Russians seemed to be in a fair way of beginning peace negotiations. Polish forces were barely holding their own in desultory warfare. The Allies were discouraging the extreme Polish claims. Today the Polish armies aided by those Ukrainians who are still loyal to General Petlura are at the gates of Kiev and seek to win Odessa. The Polish attack came at the time when the Soviet government had demobilized some of its forces or turned them into "work armies." Other troops were busy capturing the oil fields around Baku. Trotsky kept them on that job even after the Polish drive began. Perhaps he wanted oil more than territory; perhaps he did not worry too much about the Ukraine. The Poles may not prove more popular with the inhabitants than the Germans, and however brave and well trained their troops, their resources are scarcely adequate to a long war with Russia. In short, the Polish advance is sensational but hardly likely to be more enduring than some of the successes of Yudenitch or Denikin.

But whatever the final result the sad fact stands out that more lives are lost in an utterly inexcusable war of oppression. According to Mr. H. P. Davidson, of the American Red Cross, Poland and the Ukraine alike are ravaged with typhus and threatened with starvation. What madness adds war to these plagues? The answers are various. "Po-

land has a big army which she does not dare to demobilize, as there is no work to give to ex-soldiers," writes Walter Duranty, correspondent of the *New York Times*. Then there is the incorrigible imperialism of the upper-class Poles, their desire to secure possession of East Galician oil wells, and for a port (Odessa) on the Black Sea. Back of Poland is France furnishing arms, munitions, officers to her ally in the hope of getting a kind of claim on the wheat of the Ukraine, which in happier times was the granary of Europe. Polish occupation of Odessa might also make Rumanian wheat, of which there is believed still to be a store, more available to her French ally. Francs are worth more in the Ukraine or Rumania than in Canada, the United States, or Argentine.

Guns or Food

THIS Polish adventure concerns us more nearly than we may think. The administration which waged unauthorized war in North Russia is aiding the Poles. Our War Department has "sold" enormous quantities of war material. The Polish Government pays in bonds which are at present worthless. No wonder the *London Nation*, April 10, comments bitterly: "Thus America, which will do nothing to help the peaceful part of Europe in its economic trials, decides to back Poland in a Russian war much as we backed Denikin. Polish propaganda has evidently made the most of the ingenuous material of American public opinion. And yet the Polish 'peace' terms are by far the most predatory in the recent records of Europe." Still more amazing is an Associated Press despatch on April 15th which relates that "American airmen" cooperating with the Poles bombed the Bolsheviks. Whence came these airmen? Are they merely Americans who have volunteered in this Polish army, or are they nominally in our service? The business of Americans in Europe today ought to be to fight typhus and starvation and nothing else. In that fight we have some heroes. Would that there were more and that they were more generously supported in this hour of tragic need. There is still time to bring pressure on Congress to secure an appropriation for the relief of Europe's hunger. Our motto might well be millions for food, not one cent for militarism.

The Task of the Socialist Party

TO a later convention of one of the conservative parties will fall the task of nominating the next President of the United States; but to none can fall the honor of nominating a braver, truer man than that "saint in prison garb," the Socialist leader, Eugene V. Debs. The convention which nominated him was a practical body rather suspicious of phrases. It thought it saw a chance for a big Socialist vote, and it tried "to talk American" to American workers. Indeed, to some of its critics

it seemed too politically minded, while to others it was outrageously conservative! It repeatedly refused to tie itself to the Russian formula, "the dictatorship of the proletariat through the power of the soviet," though it endorsed a qualified affiliation with the Moscow Third International. Nevertheless, the nomination of Debs and the proceedings of the convention as a whole made it plain that the Socialist party has not forgotten that its purpose is not primarily the achieving of certain immediate political results but the education of the American working classes (1) in genuine internationalism and (2) in a consciousness that the way of escape both from war and oppression is not in this particular reform or that, but in the thorough-going—that is, revolutionary—transformation of our present economic system. It is a transformation which the Socialists desire to achieve by peaceful means.

A Forward-Looking Farmers' Organisation

"PLEASE don't send me THE WORLD TOMORROW any longer. I was born a Democrat and I mean to die one." This interesting sentence from a letter we have received is characteristic of a large though fortunately diminishing class of Americans. It has been particularly true that the farmers were conservative and stuck to the party of their fathers. That is why the Nonpartisan League movement has been so hopeful a sign. Recently the National Board of Farm Organizations has taken significant action. It is trying to arrange for a conference and affiliation with the well organized farmers of Canada, and has adopted a program which it intends to present to both the political parties. The program demands, among other things, the right of collective bargaining, conservation of forests, elimination of middlemen, legislation against great holdings of land, federal control of the packing industry, elastic credits for farmers, no universal military training. This action is enormously hopeful. No industry is as important as the feeding of mankind, and the outlook for sufficient food production has been dark.

The Underpaid Postman

IN several states an aroused public opinion has forced legislatures to raise the salaries of teachers; the same potent force has at last secured from Congress a Civil Service retirement bill which makes some provision for the old age of the underpaid employees of the federal government. The next step is to give the postal employees a fair deal and save the system from further demoralization. More effective as an illustration of their need than figures as to wages and resignations is the story of one competent carrier of whom we have heard. In order to support his family he is obliged to eke out his government salary by working in an express company office every night after the day's work is done. The situation requires prompt action by Congress.

Can a Christian Be Neutral?

By NORMAN THOMAS

IN a recent thoughtful pamphlet Richard Roberts thus interprets Christian ethics: "The ethically Right is that which creates, deepens, expands fellowship and restores it when it is broken. The ethically wrong is that which denies and hinders fellowship. . . . *Our common life today is ordered, and Justice is administered on the basis of a doctrine of individual rights that are always potentially in conflict. The ultimate Right as Jesus saw and taught it was based on a doctrine of human interests that are always in fact identical.* The Christian ethic is essentially the practise of self-identification with the other man—what the New Testament calls love."

Mr. Roberts' statement will probably be applauded by most thoughtful folk today whether or not they call themselves Christian. It is only on a basis of a faith in an identity of human interest which can be realized in life that modern man can be saved from cynicism or despair. The war has shown us the recurring catastrophes to which conflict of interests leads.

THE AGE-OLD YEARNING

Throughout the long years men have sought some principle on which to build an enduring civilization. They have not found it in the conception of a world state or a world church, in the unifying influence of trade, or in any form of imperialism, ancient or modern, political or economic. They must turn to Jesus' principle of brotherhood. Does not the very desperateness of our present situation commend the necessity of forgiveness and the restoration of comradeship, and plead with the voices of millions of our dead for a new faith in the solidarity of those who share together the mystery and dignity of God's gift of life?

Scientifically there is nothing impossible about the practical attainment of fellowship. The Greeks believed that civilization had to rest on slavery, for unless some men toiled other men could not be free to think, to plan, and to create. We live in an age when machinery may be our slave. There is science and skill enough to feed, clothe, and house the whole world in comfort on the basis of an average working day certainly less than eight hours in duration. As never before mankind is victor in the struggle for mastery over physical forces.

But we have won this potential freedom at the terrible cost of becoming slaves to the very machinery that ought to emancipate us. As Bergson reminded us in the early days of the war, the body of mankind has outgrown its soul. The creative instinct, the artistic sense have somehow been

crushed by the juggernaut of machine production. The modern workman is more of a cog in the machine than the artisan of the Middle Ages. And he has not yet succeeded in winning compensation for the mechanical nature of his toil in enlarged leisure.

DEBTOR TO OUR BROTHER

More serious, however, than this aspect of man's relations to machinery is his ethical plight. Every one of us takes toll day by day of the labor of his fellows all over the world. We are debtor to our brother though he be an unknown blackman who gathers rubber for us in the jungles of Africa; and we requite that debt by placing upon him a burden grievous to bear. Our modern life depends for its riches upon the labor and the resources of the whole earth, yet we have organized our economic theory upon the basis not of cooperation but of competition. We are caught in a trap wherein to try to fulfill the golden rule outside the narrow limits of one's family and friends seems almost to invite destruction. In an older day a whole tribe might starve, but while the tribe had food the children of the tribe were fed. But in our day of machinery millions and millions of children go naked and hungry. The reason is plain. We have sanctified special privilege; we do not produce goods for use but for profit, and profit depends upon scarcity. Occasionally a strike reminds us of our dependence upon one another and we cry out against the laborer who does not mine the coal or keep the trains running. But how can we blame him? Capital also strikes over and over when the profits that feed it fail. Even the farmer is leaving the land because his arduous toil brings so little profit. However he may resent the strike of the coal miners or railway men he also is compelled to restrict production either by unorganized or organized action. Milk strikes, for instance, are by no means an unknown recourse of the dairymen who find themselves the victims of the distributor. Behind all these manifestations of discontent and social maladjustment lies entrenched privilege which in its various forms has made the political state its tool. And the state claims an intensity of devotion and a blindness of faith never sought by any ecclesiastical body. It marshals its millions for insensate war and tortures and slays its hundreds of thousands of sacrificial victims with worse than savage cruelty.

It is no wonder that some men are looking back to bygone centuries as to a golden age. The wistful backward look of Ralph Adams Cram's *Walled Towns* has a real significance for our generation despite its obvious limitations and errors in judgment.

The author seems utterly to fail to realize, for instance, how powerless would be his islands of peace and beauty to withstand the engulfing floods of international war. But making all allowances for the enchantment that distance has lent to Mr. Cram's view of mediaevalism, it is true that the artisan in his guild or the peasant on his land might go down to his grave with a conscience freer from reproach of injury—voluntary or involuntary—to his neighbor than is possible to any of us whose daily life is bound up with the coercions of the present system. And the cathedrals these guildsmen built and the joy of life they express are proof that the yoke of the church was easier and its burden lighter than the yoke of the modern capitalist state.

We cannot return to bygone ages. If we could we should not find them wholly good. Neither can we solve our problem by a revival of asceticism, though always we must remember that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of his possessions. Our one hope is in the cooperative social control of natural resources and machinery with the steadfast purpose to "make the human spirit at home in the material world." Leadership there must be and control, but leadership and control must rest on consent, not upon force, upon ability and understanding, not upon the chance ownership of property or inherited privilege. In short, the first task of spiritual ethics as of rational economics is a collective emancipation of men which cannot be achieved under our present competitive capitalistic social system.

LABOR MOVES TOWARD THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL

The one force actively, though often blindly, working to that end is labor. Therefore it seems to us that the logic of the Christian ethic compels men of good will in every walk of life to cooperate in the emancipation of labor. For some men that may involve a generous renunciation of immediate personal interests. The Christian cannot be neutral. To say that "the church ideally takes no side in the conflict between capital and labor; it is a moral arbiter standing for eternal principles of right," may sound well but is essentially fallacious. It is precisely the *right* as Mr. Roberts defines *right* which the present capitalistic system denies. We cannot in a world of stern reality preach a sentimental fellowship unless we desire the abolition of a system which divides men into inevitably antagonistic classes, and fans the fires of race hatred. Of course labor is not always wise in its groping toward a new world. It, too, has been infected by racial and nationalistic antagonisms and by the philosophy of profit-seeking. Yet with all the jealousies which divide the labor movement the very conditions under which the wage laborer lives have kept him truer to the principle of comradeship than is the average member of the middle class. Here, for instance, is a small silk shop. Dull days came in the industry. The boss could no longer keep his whole force, so he made careful selection among the men who seemed

to him most docile and told the others they were dismissed. The shop struck. The workers were not unreasonable. They did not expect the individual boss to make work when there was none; but they proposed that what work there was should be divided among all the laborers. Finally in this particular case they reached this agreement: Two-thirds of the men were taken back, the individuals chosen being determined in conference between the boss and the union, and these individuals shared proportionately with their comrades who could get no work. There was some friction but the plan worked. Still more striking evidence of real comradeship is to be found in the great garment workers' union, where "pro-rating work" among all the workers is an accepted custom in dull times. Is not this spirit more hopeful in the building of the new social order than anything to be found among other classes? The tremendous significance of the Russian experiment is, of course, the spiritual effort to put this spirit of cooperation into the tasks of production. We do not mean that workers are finer clay, but only that the bondage of the present system has perhaps left worse scars on the souls of the successful than upon the toilers. The difficulties that are ahead require all the wisdom, the courage, and the hopefulness men and women of good will may bring to bear. Our problem is one of production and distribution; it concerns man as consumer as truly as producer; it requires new motives and principles in education as well as in industry. But we must not let the perplexities of the situation make us mere lookers-on in Venice, spectators of the struggle in whose result is bound up the salvation of all our lives. Humanity's business requires haste. We cannot afford to wait until capitalistic imperialism brings us to its inevitable end—another war. We have come to a time when we cannot console ourselves with a little reform here and a little there. We must reaffirm the old Christian faith in the possibility and necessity of conversion. Social conversion means nothing short of a revolution in men's attitude to life and in their organization of their common affairs.

OUR PERSONAL TASK

We are justified in working for the speedy fulfillment of our hopes. It is no part of God's desire, no predetermined necessity of fate that for further generations the beautiful and gracious things of life should be trampled out:

"On a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

Holding this faith, it is the task of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* to bring to light those things which are systematically withheld from the eyes of the people. It is our task to expose hypocrisy, to warn against the danger that ideals be dissipated in sentiment, to plead the cause of the oppressed and the friend-

less. It is not always pleasant thus to strive to speak the truth or to suggest the application to current lives of principles whose beauty is easily accepted in the study. No one can do it infallibly; he who tries must guard his soul against bitterness; yet the effort must be made. And with that effort should go an eager search for every evidence of that reasonableness, that capacity for wise and self-forgetful service of the common good, which is the

hope of the future and the glory of humankind.

To some of our readers our emphasis upon certain stern realities of life seems pessimistic. It is not. True pessimism is to believe that life is not worth while. We who believe that the divine fire is inextinguishable, are inspired by that faith to appeal continually to men to see what perils beset their path and to beg them to turn to the road that leads to comradeship and peace.

The Balkan Tangle

By R. H. MARKHAM

WHEN Nature created Europe she put her best material into the southeast corner.

To other parts she gave deserts, swamps, excessive snows, fogs, and floods, but to the Balkan Peninsula an ideal climate, five seas, one of her greatest rivers, broad fields, and rich mines. As soon as man arrived, however, he turned this favored spot into a valley of the shadow of death. All the great conquerors of old left their red traces of fire and blood on the peninsula, while ruthless hordes of Greeks and savages, Huns and Slavs, Romans and Crusaders pillaged, ravaged, and killed the Balkan peoples. Men built houses for strangers to live in, pressed out wine for aliens to drink, ground flour for enemies to eat, and married wives for invaders to outrage.

As a result of all these invasions the most picturesque corner of Europe came to be inhabited by Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbs, Rumanians, Montenegrins, and Albanians. These peoples very often found their interests or aspirations conflicting, and because of mutual wrongs oft inflicted they covered their land with the devastating fury of race hatred. But all these hates were swallowed up in the fourteenth century by the wild flood of Turkish conquest which swept through Greece, across the Balkan mountains and over the Danube to the gates of Vienna and the plains of Poland and Russia. For almost five hundred years the Balkan peoples lay submerged in this sea. Fifteen generations of their sons fought in the armies of their oppressors. Fifteen generations of their daughters languished in the harems of their oppressors. Mental activity was stifled. Progress was smothered.

But at last the peoples living on the edge of this darkness saw a great light. The fire kindled in Paris, when oppressed Frenchmen struggled to throw off the despotic yoke of emperors and nobles, was reflected in Belgrade, and the Serbians plunged into a series of fierce glorious revolts to free themselves from Turkish tyranny. Greece later joined the conflict and by means of Russia's help gained a degree of freedom. Just before our Civil War Rumania's turn came, and about twenty years later Russia completed her liberating task in the Balkans

by freeing the Bulgarians and driving the Turks back to Constantinople.

Russia's treaty with Turkey signed at San Stefano in 1878 promised a large degree of freedom, racial unity, prosperity, and international cooperation to the peoples of the Balkans. This treaty not only excluded the Turk from most of his European possessions but it also made the boundaries between the Balkan peoples correspond, in the main, to racial composition and sentiments of national allegiance.

But a European Peace Conference intervened and the last chapter in Balkan history began, a chapter which is not yet concluded and in which the great world war is an episode. England feared that the large and unified Bulgaria which Russia had just created might become Russia's "trans-Danubian province" and thus enable the great Slav empire to become the predominating power in the Balkans. Austria naturally sympathized with this view. So the diplomats of Europe gathered together at Berlin, revised the Russo-Turkish treaty, restored the Turks to Europe, and cut Bulgaria up into three parts, two of which, Eastern Rumelia and Macedonia, they again subjected to the horrors of Turkish misrule. Seven years later Eastern Rumelia joined itself to Bulgaria, and only Macedonia was left in darkness, doomed like Cain of old to languish outside the society of fortunate peoples.

THE STRUGGLE FOR MACEDONIA

From 1878 to 1920 Macedonia has been the stage of a terrible international tragedy. Most of the people there are Bulgarians, many are Greeks, a large number are Turks, and a few are Rumanians. Almost none are Serbians. For forty years all these races have been fighting among themselves for control of this unfortunate district. The acquisition of Macedonia has been the aim of the foreign policy of Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia. And these racial rivalries cherished by the smaller Balkan powers have been sedulously and unscrupulously fostered by one or another of the greater powers for their own selfish ends. Austria and the Central Powers wished to dominate the Balkans that they might get

possession of Salonica, one of the best harbors of the Mediterranean, and also control the road through Constantinople from Berlin to Bagdad. Russia, on the other hand, aspired to dominate the Balkans that she might control Constantinople and the Dardanelles and thus secure an ice-free entrance into the western world, a thing of which she was and is in desperate need. Macedonia became the victim of this unrestrained selfishness on the part of her neighbors, great and small. Her mountains were filled with armed bands; her roads patrolled by kidnapers; her villages burned; houses plundered; banks blown up; homes violated. Insurrections, revolts, suspicions, arrests, fear, and race hatred turned Macedonia into a hell, where every man was a wolf to his neighbor.

In 1912 a miracle occurred. Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians ceased killing each other and joined hands in a war of liberation against the common oppressor of all. But the miracle was of short duration. After the little powers overwhelmingly defeated the Turks, Serbia, supported by Greece, refused to abide by a formal written agreement, made before the war, as to the disposition of Macedonia. After a long period of fruitless negotiations, the Bulgarian king without the knowledge of his government ordered his armies to attack the Serbs and Greeks all along the line.

When the Bulgarian prime minister learned of this treachery on the following morning, he ordered the Bulgarian armies to return to their former positions and telegraphed to the Russian Czar to intervene. But it was too late. Greece and Serbia refused all arbitration. The passions of impatient armies were aroused. Bulgaria paid for the treacherous folly of her king. Pressed back by Serbia, Greece, Turkey, and Rumania she was forced to sue for peace, which was concluded in Bucharest. Serbia and Greece received most of Macedonia, while Rumania helped herself to three thousand miles of excellent Bulgarian wheat fields and three hundred thousand Bulgarian citizens in Dobrudja. The treaty of Berlin was superseded by the still more pernicious Treaty of Bucharest, where more than a million Bulgarians passed under the sovereignty of their most bitter enemies. For her enormous efforts in the war of liberation, Bulgaria received little more than an outlet into the Aegean Sea.

BULGARIA THROWS HER DICE AND LOSES

Two years passed. The Bulgarians in Macedonia and Dobrudja suffered persecutions and endured oppressions which surpassed all the coercive acts inflicted by the Germans in Alsace-Lorraine. The great powers, engaged in mortal combat, sought Bulgaria's aid. Because of her control over the railroad from Berlin to Constantinople, Bulgaria was in a position to render a great service. Her conditions were known to the world and were not unreasonable. Nothing was hid. There was little bargaining, no deception, no dissimulation. What

Bulgaria demanded was the complete "liberty and union" of which she had dreamed and for which she had fought during many decades. The Entente would not grant this unification. Bulgaria could not fight to perpetuate the oppression of her own people.

Germany started her drive to clear the track to Constantinople. Bulgaria had to decide for one side or the other. She took the side of the enemy of her enemy, and became the enemy of the powers who became our associates.

Bulgaria lost. She paid for her mistake when peace was signed at Neuilly last November. She was forced to give Serbia two small districts on her western border inhabited exclusively by Bulgarians, and a part of the small section of Macedonia which she received after the war with Turkey. She was also deprived of her outlet to the Aegean Sea. Bulgaria now has a population of four and a half millions and a territory as large as the state of Indiana. On every corner she has an Alsace-Lorraine to recover.

All her neighbors have received enormous acquisitions in population and territory. At last all the Balkan peoples, save the Bulgarians and Albanians, have attained their national unification. Greece has increased in population from less than three millions in 1910 to six or perhaps eight millions. Her territory has doubled, making her larger than Pennsylvania. Rumania's population of seven millions has doubled as has the size of her territory. She is now almost as large as Colorado, almost twice as large as Pennsylvania. In 1910 Belgrade was the capital of a little state much smaller than West Virginia and with a population less than three millions. At present Belgrade is the capital of a new state of united Serbs, known as Jugo-Slavia, which has a population of twelve millions and an area much more than three times as large as West Virginia.

AFTER-WAR CHAOS IN THE BALKANS

This sudden and enormous expansion of the three largest Balkan states and the partial dismemberment of the fourth has created a very dangerous situation in Southeast Europe. Greece, the financial condition of which has been unstable for many years, has a host of implacable enemies within her borders and is faced by a group of relentless enemies without. The enmity of Turkey, Bulgaria, and Albania is absolutely certain while Italy's friendship is most uncertain. Rumania is in an equally perilous position. Her people are among the most illiterate in Europe. Her fertile lands are not equitably divided. Her treatment of subject races and lesser religions is a relic of the days of the Russian Czar. Her intolerance toward socialists is matched only by that of the State of New York. Her army is the poorest in the Balkans. In spite of her wealth and size Rumania is a very unstable element in an unstable situation.

Jugo-Slavia finds herself in an especially critical

position. This new state, brought full grown into being, with a population of simple people ignorant, inexperienced, and largely illiterate, embraces divergent and even conflicting racial, religious, and political elements. After seven years of war she faces many very urgent and extremely difficult internal problems. From the day of her creation until now she has had no really stable ministry. Cabinet after cabinet has fallen. The value of her money is depreciating. Various sections of the people do not agree as to the form of the future government. Various groups are in disagreement as to the division of the large estates taken over from Austria-Hungary. Many of her railroads, roads, and public buildings are in ruins. For four years many of her children have not been in school. Half a million of her men are dead. The land is full of orphans, sick, blind, and maimed and there are no hospitals or homes for them.

Jugo-Slavia must build up anew her whole economic, political, and social structure. All efforts must be given to national unification and reconstruction. And this is precisely the supreme task of all the Balkan states. For this, peace is essential. Without tranquility and harmony in the Balkans the peoples cannot bind up their wounds. The Balkan states must come to an understanding.

THE SUPREME NECESSITY—PEACE

Fortunately Bulgaria is controlled at the present moment by a radical agricultural party, which has always advocated a union of the Balkan states, a Balkan Confederation. Since coming into power in October, the Bulgarian prime minister, Mr. Stam-

boliski, has worked incessantly toward that end. He offers peace and amity to all his neighbors. He is endeavoring to secure for Bulgaria a place in a Balkan Union, in which all races whether in the majority or minority shall be treated with complete justice and equity. If the various Balkan states do not come to an understanding with Bulgaria they themselves will suffer for their blunder.

The Balkan Peninsula is a delightful place to live in. It affords everything that men like to eat, drink, smoke, or look at. The people, moreover, in most respects are unusually promising. Eighty-five per cent. of them are farmers. They are sober, industrious, chaste, frugal. In some of the states most of the young men are literate. For example, in 1917 only five per cent. of the Bulgarian recruits were unable to read and write. The Balkan peoples have excellent schools, sing beautiful songs, write the best of novels. Their doctors are efficient, their engineers skilled. The distribution of land, for the most part, is fair. The forms of government are democratic in the extreme. All amusements are wholesome. Poverty is rare. Slums do not exist.

Nature has provided all the human and physical elements necessary to make the Balkan Peninsula one of the most prosperous, beautiful, and well-kept spots on earth. Only one thing has made the Balkans a synonym for backwardness, darkness, and death. That is war. Just one thing is supremely necessary. That is peace.

If the Balkan states refuse to accept Bulgaria's appeals for understanding, reconciliation, and alliance they will rekindle the fires which smoulder in the fastnesses of the Balkan mountains.

The Strike

A Symposium

Last month we printed two open letters from Henry J. Cadbury and Norman Thomas on the ethics of the strike. Here the discussion is continued by a number of contributors. Under the heading "Open for Discussion" we also publish a number of letters from our readers on the question of the strike.

A Better Way

THE VIEW OF JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

OWING to illness it is impossible for Dr. Holmes to contribute to the strike symposium. He has, however, authorized this summary of his position from his new book, *Is Violence the Way Out?* which we present with some diffidence, knowing that no summary can really be adequate.

Dr. Holmes' book as a whole is "an attempt to apply to the perilous industrial situation of our time the doctrine of non-resistance." He makes it clear that he is distinctly on the side of labor, whose cause is the cause of human emancipation and of peace.

He states the provocation labor has had and the restraint the workers have shown. Nevertheless, he argues against the strike in its modern form.

"In the beginning the strike was a spontaneous revolt of tortured men"—an act of martyrdom on the part of men willing "to suffer and die rather than continue longer the bondslaves of oppression." Later it became an organized form of revolt, but was still an act of martyrdom. "Now, in our time, has come the transformation of the strike from an act of martyrdom to an act of war. The strike today is not passive resistance to, but aggressive attack upon, injustice. It is revolt in terms not of suffering, but of battle and conquest. The strikers are now an army, organized for warfare against those who hold them in subjection. Which means that at the bottom of the strike today is the principle of coercion—coercion of the worker to join the union and the strike, coercion of the employer to yield to an ultimatum of terms; coercion of the whole body of citizenship to the support of labor at

* Dodd Mead & Co., New York.

the cost of indescribable misery and social peril! Coercion, of course, is force, and therefore do we see the strike, originally a method of peaceful protest and agitation used in the spirit of martyrdom, developing into a weapon of violence used in the spirit and to the ends of war."

The strike thus defined is first of all unnecessary. "Nothing in this world is necessary but that which is right, nor yet can it be conceded that good ends can be used to justify bad means." Even from a pragmatic standpoint the strike is unnecessary in a spiritual universe inhabited by men sensitive to the influence of spiritual forces. The real triumph is always a triumph of ideas, and it is voluntary suffering which opens "the mind of the enemy to the truth of the idea" for which one suffers.

The strike is not only unnecessary but dangerous because it at once shifts the issue from the justice of labor's cause to the right and wrong of violence. This contention is illustrated by the history of recent strikes, in particular the miners' strike in 1919. "Suppose now when their demands were refused that these miners had resorted not to the method of violence, but of martyrdom . . . suppose that they had used the \$15,000,000 in their war chest which was lost to them at the beginning of the strike by the government injunction to inform the American people of their action and to educate them on the question of operatives' wages and operators' profits." Would not the result have been a victory more sweeping and enduring than otherwise was possible?

The ideal solution for our present industrial situation is in an act of renunciation on the part of capital and of generosity on the part of labor. Granting that no such ideal solution is immediately probable, still there is a "better way." This better way includes: (1) The establishment of industrial courts to hear disputes on wages and hours. "Capital would have to concede the closed shop and the right of collective bargaining . . . labor on the other hand would have to concede its right to strike." Such courts would of course settle only "merely temporary and superficial questions," and there is always the danger that they would "fall into the hands of capital just as many of our civil courts have done." (2) Courts therefore must be supplemented by a second more fundamental method, namely, the organization of a labor party. "The Nonpartisan League has shown us the way in the state of North Dakota." If, for example, the laborers of Pennsylvania "had sought solidarity at the ballot box" instead of "solidarity in the strike" as did the farmers in North Dakota, "the greatest industrial center in America would have been redeemed from the rule of capitalism." And what is true of Pennsylvania is of course true of the nation. (3) Most fundamental of all substitutes for the strike is the Cooperative Movement, whose success has already been so great in Europe. "The essentially permanent success in the great constructive

task of building the new state that is to come can be won as it is being won by industrial cooperation. . . . Let labor put by its strikes and seek as its most effective work the building of that independent cooperative state which will enable it even now to avoid the trammels of capitalistic tyranny. And lo, like the shell which withers when true life has broken forth, our present system will disappear, and humanity at last be free."

The Worker Must Not Surrender the Right to Strike

By JAMES H. MAURER

THE workers can never afford to surrender their right to strike, whether or not industry be run for profit. To do so would eventually mean servitude.

"Is there a just way to avoid strikes?" Yes, there are many ways to avoid strikes. Let the employer swallow some of the arrogance and contempt he too often shows toward the grievances of his employees; establish the policy of collective bargaining; pay more attention to his business and not pin so much faith on the opinions of his superintendents and managers; pay managers and superintendents salaries instead of bonuses on production and pay-roll, and thus remove the incentive to grind out increased produce with decreased pay. This, to be sure, means that the owner or owners must be contented with a reasonable profit, but it would be a just way to avoid strikes.

"What limits are to be set to the use of strikes?" I don't see how there can be any limits.

"Is there any justification for the use of strikes for other than questions of immediate improvement of working conditions in the industry affected?" Yes, there are many good reasons. Transferring orders and sometimes materials from a striking shop to one not on strike is quite a proper cause for the workers in the second shop to strike rather than "scab" on their fellow-workers in the striking shop. Again, a company may own or control a chain of mills, scattered throughout a dozen or more cities. A strike may take place in one of them. The company simply locks up the striking mill and has its orders filled in the other mills and waits until its employees in the striking mill are starved into submission. By this action the mill owners make fair mills unfair, and the workers are justified in striking in every mill the company owns or controls.

Another illustration is the late steel strike. Surely these workers had good cause to strike against the eighty-two-hour work-week and twenty-four-hour Sunday shift. To break this strike, the Steel Companies engaged an army of "sluggers," subsidized the Pittsburgh and other municipal police, secured the aid of practically every public official from Township Constable and State Police

to Governor. Thus do we see how the mill owners, in their eagerness to crush their employees, do not hesitate to use even the people's official family and, by so doing, take the strike out and away from the industry and people directly concerned. Through the aid of these public officials, the strikers and strike sympathizers were robbed of their civil rights and constitutional guarantees; they were denied free speech and public assemblage; thousands were arrested, hundreds were beaten up; and twenty were deliberately murdered. The Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, representing more than five hundred thousand organized workers, after doing everything possible in a lawful and orderly manner to restore law and order in the State, failed; and finally, as a last resource, at a special convention decided to inaugurate a State-wide strike. Fortunately, the steel strike ended before our plans for tying up the entire State were complete. But who among the Liberty-loving, red-blooded Americans would dare contend that such a strike would not be justifiable?

To the last question as to whether or not there are certain occupations so vitally necessary to the public that strikes in them ought to be prohibited, let me say: We must not lose sight of the fact that the workers, or strikers, are part of this much-talked-of public. There can be no occupation so vitally necessary to common life that it justifies those dependent upon such occupations in neglecting or permitting to be neglected over-work or under-pay of the workers who are so essential to their existence. If they do, then they have no right to complain or expect special consideration when such workers, so vitally necessary, strike in order to live or keep apace with other workers. The fact that such workers are more necessary than others to the common life should not furnish an excuse for placing them at a disadvantage by denying them rights or privileges that others enjoy. Rather, if there is to be any discrimination, it should be in favor of such workers whose occupations are so vitally necessary to the common life.

Strikes, like war, will be with us as long as one class in society is permitted to feed upon, rob, and exploit the other. Strikes, like wars, will never be abolished until we remove the cause responsible for strikes and wars.

Every Strike Is Right

By UPTON SINCLAIR

I FORGET whether it was Wendell Phillips or William Lloyd Garrison who said (I quote from memory the second half of the sentence), "A state of slavery is a state of war; its secure peace is but a truce." I would say that no one can think straight on the subject of strikes without bearing in mind that capitalism is wage slavery, and wage slavery is not metaphorically but actually and literally what the name implies. Workmen under the profit sys-

tem are deprived of their fundamental rights as producers. They are deprived of the full value of their product and of control of their own destinies as workers. They are deprived of access to the God-created sources of wealth, which are necessary to the existence of every human being. A society which deprives men of these fundamental rights is an outlaw thing, and cannot come into any court of justice to plead. From the point of view of morality, every strike is right, every strike is justifiable. The only question to be considered about any strike is the question of expediency. Is this particular strike likely to help or to hinder the workers in their efforts to escape from the system of industry for private profit? If all the workers in all the vital industries of the world could be brought to strike tomorrow, and thereby force the immediate socialization of all vital industries, that strike would not merely be justifiable, it would be the most beneficent event in human history, the one from which all the future of mankind would be dated.

Why Not Eliminate Other Forms of Industrial Waste First?

By ROGER W. BARSON

NOBODY would be disposed to deny that the strike in industry is an exceedingly wasteful process. Our newspapers and magazines have of late seized upon this universally admitted fact and made it the basis for an argument for the elimination of strikes.

To my thinking, the argument is not sound. If we are going to start out eliminating waste in our industrial and economic life, we should make a thorough job of it. We should eliminate all the waste that we can find and we should make it our job to find all the waste there is.

Now, the waste which is caused by strikes is by no means all the waste that is going on in our industrial life, nor, in my judgment, is it the most serious or extensive waste. What I mean is this: The organization of our productive industries in this country has not proceeded along rational lines. We have followed the line of least resistance. We have taken advantage of the law of supply and demand with its various shifts and transformations and have gone ahead, each man for himself, considering ourselves fortunate if we made out personally to get ahead by the process. This method of doing things is absolutely American. In fact, it is one-hundred per cent. Americanism. At the same time, it is entirely irrational.

Furthermore, the whole industrial situation is at present in a state of war. There is no cooperation between employer and employee for the prime purpose of production. There is no application of the principles of scientific management to the problem of production.

Last of all, the dominant thought in our whole industrial machinery is not how can we produce

the most, but how can we profit the most. If a man sees that he can make the same profit turning out half the capacity of his plant that he can by producing at full capacity, his natural instinct is to do the least work possible in order to make the greatest amount of money.

It is not appropriate, therefore, in my judgment, for us to undertake to eliminate the strike upon the argument of wastefulness until we are prepared to go the whole figure and eliminate waste wherever it is found.

There is, of course, another side to the question. There is a certain class of strikes which are a death-blow to our community life. These are strikes upon public utilities and upon the commodities which are used in daily consumption. These strikes should not occur. It is one thing, however, to say this. It is another thing to devise machinery to take care of the issues which cause strikes in these industries. Until we have devised such machinery it is idle for us to talk about eliminating the strike, even in this kind of business.

Furthermore, in all industries, whether of the so-called essential kind or not, it has still to be recognized that the strike is labor's one last-resort weapon. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States this weapon is recognized as labor's legitimate means of defense. Again and again commissions of inquiry have investigated this industrial problem and have pointed out to us what we should do. The latest case of this kind is that of the President's Commission which has just reported. Fundamentally all of these reports are alike. Fundamentally also the American public is unwilling to accept them, and no sooner is one of these reports submitted than we find somebody, like Senator Kenyon, moving that another body be appointed to investigate the subject again.

The proper course for us to take has already been plainly charted. It is our duty in the interests of American industry to take the positive, constructive steps which have been urged upon us throughout the last decade in order to mend industrial conditions. Until we reach the point where we can do this thing, it is idle for us to discuss the wastefulness that goes on in industry.

The Strike a Necessary Compromise in a Practical World

By EVAN THOMAS

IN any discussion of the ethics of the strike the defender of the moral right to strike will inevitably fall back upon practical arguments. The strike is essentially a practical weapon in the hands of the workers. As such it plays a most important part in the class struggle. It is a weapon involving coercion and is a test of power. It is on a very different moral plane relatively than war, but it involves a serious dissipation of energy and when employed on a great scale may bring wide-

spread suffering and economic waste. No sane person will argue the inherent value to society of the strike.

Having made this admission, it is impossible to discuss the ethics of the strike on the high plane of absolute idealism outlined by Mr. Cadbury.

The vital question is whether man can actually live in society today without recognizing the use of coercion in some form or another. Can the individual in an industrial world earn a living and not compromise the high ideals used in support of Mr. Cadbury's contention that the strike is unethical? Even such thoroughgoing anarchists as Tolstoy and Thoreau from the point of view of absolute ideals are not free from the charge of compromise at some point or another. But one can hardly take exception to a Thoreau or a Tolstoy objecting to the organized strike, for they were actually trying to live what they preached, frankly renouncing organized machine industry and private property.

Once one accepts willingly or unwillingly the machine industry of today and private property, one has accepted coercion to a tremendous extent and has thereby made one's self dependent on practical considerations inherent in all organized society, where it is no longer possible to argue moral values solely on the high plane of abstract principles and the absolute ideals of the Sermon on the Mount.

Thus it is that unless one finds it possible to be so self-sufficient as to accept the absolute anarchistic point of view, not merely in theory, but in practical life as well, any discussion as to the ethics of the strike must be conducted on the plane of what is practical as well as of what is ideal. Then indeed the question of what is the alternative to the strike may be asked with justice. As a conscientious objector in the war, my grounds for refusing all forms of service—combatant, non-combatant, or alternative—were almost entirely idealistic; but in practice my refusal to accept service amounted to a strike, and the more others joined in the refusal to serve, the more this refusal resembled in every way an organized strike.

What I am trying to point out is that unless one is ready to go the whole way of absolute non-resistant anarchy it is not only fair but necessary to take practical arguments into consideration in forming ethical judgments. The strike is a form of coercion. So is all organization and all government known to man. The traffic policeman is of practical value to society very largely because he can resort to the coercion of organized society. All property and especially all rent and interest depend on coercion often in its very worst forms. Anyone who can see the moral evils involved in the strike must be equally honest in seeing the far worse evils involved in a capitalistic society; and if he would deny the moral right of the one he must deny himself the right to use the courts or to hold private property under capitalism.

A Visit to the Home of Tagore

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

FOUR great attractions had drawn us to India: the Taj Mahal, that marvel of architecture, the Himalaya Mountains with their eternal snows, the great missionary enterprise which is playing such a vital part in the awakening of India and . . . Rabindra Nath Tagore. Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore he is called in the papers; but because of certain differences of opinion between himself and the British government in regard to the latter's treatment of the people of India he has surrendered his knighthood and prefers to be just Dr. Tagore.

It was a beautiful day in December, a day which seemed like a May or June day in New York, with balmy breezes and a sun that was neither too hot nor too cold; Nature had indeed blessed us with a rare day for our pilgrimage to Shanti Niketan, the home of the gentle poet-philosopher of India. We had arranged a couple of days before with a member of his family in Calcutta for an interview so that we were graciously met at the railroad station of Bolpur about one hundred miles distant and driven to his home.

"INNER FREEDOM" THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN DR. TAGORE'S SCHOOL

Immediately on our arrival Dr. Tagore greeted us most pleasantly and begged us be seated. He was clad in the flowing robe of the Bengali with a rough woolen shirt underneath and—but why describe his clothes? The man's kindly smile and keen eye focused our attention upon his countenance, and his words soon had us absorbed with him in the great problems of India and the world. The school which he has been conducting for the past twenty years was our first subject of conversation, and he told us of the ideals which had guided him in this school. The fundamental aim of the education given was "inner freedom": to withdraw compulsion from the outside and to teach these growing boys to realize themselves as individuals. Individuality was respected and no effort was made to make all alike, to pour all into a common mold. For instance, religious instruction was given but it was not "foisted" upon the students. They were asked to spend fifteen minutes both morning and evening in quiet meditation. "Of course," said Dr. Tagore, "I quite realize that good healthy boys will not do much quiet meditating at first, but the suggestion of worship and meditation is there and that will gradually have its effect." In addition to this there is a Wednesday evening meeting of a religious character.

In accord with this same principle of "inner freedom" discipline is maintained not by pressure from without but by control from within. There

is a school court, elected by the boys themselves, meeting every night to handle the cases requiring attention. The punishments given are generally in the nature of ostracism; the offenders are kept away from games, public meetings, and, incomprehensible, as it may seem to the average American school boy, from classes! The boys also are given a voice in the management of the school. They meet with the teachers and talk over the plans and rules to be followed, and the boys can vote as well as the teachers, each vote counting one whether it be cast by pupil or teacher. Of course this led to some strange rules at first, as one cannot expect boys from nine to seventeen not to experiment with their authority. They reduced the hours of work and the requirements of cleanliness, but very soon they settled down. They soon saw that such a policy was not a benefit to them, that they were the greatest losers, that a rule requiring less tidiness and cleanliness led to confusion and uncleanness for themselves, and that the same principle operated in the other fields over which they had jurisdiction. In the operation of all this plan it has been found that corporal punishment is not necessary. We asked Dr. Tagore particularly if boys were ever beaten in the school as a punishment. His answer was most vigorous. "Never," he said.

TAGORE NOT AN ABSOLUTE NON-RESISTANT

From this, of course, it was very easy to pass to a subject much discussed during the war, Non-resistance. We asked Dr. Tagore if he held the position that the taking of human life was always wrong. "No," he replied, "I find myself unable to take an extreme, absolute position of this kind. I cannot say I would never use force in this way, but I admire the men who do take this position and I believe that for the mass of mankind such a position is the proper one. Certainly it is practically impossible to say under what circumstances it is right to take human life." All this brought up the subject of the part America had played in the war. Although we did not ask the question, I believe Dr. Tagore was pleased with the part America had played in the war but he was very much disappointed at the part we had played in the peace. President Wilson, he said, had keenly disappointed him in his work at Paris. He and America had lost the great opportunity of achieving a peace based upon brotherhood. The fourteen points had not been applied so that very little good had come from the war.

At this point we were asked to see the school for ourselves with one of the teachers for a guide. This teacher, Mr. S. C. Majumdar, is a graduate

of the University of Illinois and seems as much American as Indian. It was good to hear him express himself as being "sore" at some particular happening and to hear him say that he hoped to teach the boys baseball. We were first taken to the boys' dormitories. These buildings are of typical Indian construction, well suited to the climate. In some of the dormitories the boys have cots made in native fashion of rope strung across poles, in others the boys sleep upon mats upon the floor. The boys do their own work. This in itself is a great advance, for most of the boys come from high-caste families where all physical labor is done for them. We also were delighted to be told by our guide that these boys all ate together, caste being done away with. "It is true," said Mr. Majumdar, "that some boys who come wish to keep caste and eat by themselves. We allow them to do so, but they have to look after the whole matter for themselves. They generally soon tire of this and join the other boys." As we wandered over the grounds we found everything orderly and cleanly and the boys courteous and kindly. They are taught the usual subjects such as arithmetic, reading, writing, geography, etc. Also emphasis is laid upon music, dramatics, and drawing and painting. The exclusion of these latter subjects was the criticism made of the school run by the great nationalist leader Gandhi. It is hoped soon that industrial training such as weaving, carpentry, and other trades can be taught in addition to the science of agriculture, upon which stress is laid at present. Of course the boys also have a real chance to play; there are football, hockey, and native games, and, as previously mentioned, a chance of baseball. Then, too, from time to time the boys give plays written by Dr. Tagore. This Dr. Tagore thoroughly enjoys; for, said Mr. Majumdar, "He will hop and dance like the boys." The classes are conducted under trees, each teacher having about ten or twelve boys in his class. With this method of teaching more attention and energy are spent upon teachers than upon buildings and equipment, a policy which might prove of advantage in America. At any rate, it is thoroughly in keeping with Dr. Tagore's dictum that it is the personality of the teacher that counts more than the method or surroundings.

But the time had come for us to go back to Dr. Tagore's home, a building no better than most of the other buildings of the school. Here he was awaiting us.

THE INDIAN MYSTIC VIEWS GOD

He invited us to lunch, and he and our guide of the morning and another teacher, a Cambridge graduate, sat with us in the room although not partaking of food with us. Here it seemed to us was another evidence of thoughtful hospitality—we were given what he thought we would like, European food not Indian. As we ate he told us

in a most charming manner with lowered eyes something of his religious experience. First, he said, he had felt God in nature, in the trees, in the flowers, in the sunset and the mountains. He had felt Him, "tasting the world through himself." Then as he became older he had found Him in the men and women whom he loved. This stage passed into another, and he now felt God in his own inner life, communing with his own soul. "Whether," he said, "this God is the God who made the stars and causes them to sweep in majesty through space, I know not, I care not, but He is my God, my friend and companion." As a boy, Dr. Tagore said, he had seen his father at night steal quietly into his room to see that all was well with him, and in the morning when he first opened his eyes he would see his father again watching over him and they would pray together. From his father's care and tenderness for him he came to understand something of God's love for His children. "God," said Dr. Tagore, "is realized in the stillness of one's own soul and not through historical personalities or creeds."

A CRITICISM OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES

I wish it were possible adequately to portray the loveable simplicity of this modern prophet. Here is a man who has drunk deep from the eternal springs. How much he owes to Christianity I do not know; probably more than he would acknowledge, for he knows his Bible more thoroughly than most Christians, indeed than many Christian ministers; and certainly he exemplifies the spirit of Jesus. However, he criticized the missionaries in India for not preaching and living more the simple gospel of Christ and less the cult of "westernism." He feels, with most educated Indians, that we have propagated as much the religion of western civilization as the religion of Jesus. "Missionaries," he said, "are always nationalists first and Christians second." At no time did his eye flash as when, in speaking of the recent Amritsar riots, he said, "Not a missionary as far as I know uttered a protest." Perhaps in thus pointing out that Christians were generally Englishmen, Americans, Frenchmen, or Germans first, and secondly followers of the Nazarene, Dr. Tagore shows us the reason for the slow progress we have made in bringing about a truly Christian social order.

All this and much more Dr. Tagore told us on that beautiful afternoon, and such was his religious fervor that when the time came for our departure we felt that we had not only talked with a leader alive to the problems of the day but that we had joined in worship with one of the great souls of the world. We could indeed join with him in the prayer he repeated to us:

"O God, from unreality lead us toward truth,
 "From darkness lead us toward light,
 "From death lead us toward deathlessness."

Turning the Tables On the Government

Impressions at the Trial of James Larkin

By MARY AGNES BEST

THE WORLD TOMORROW emphatically disapproves of certain features of the spirit and tactics of the Communist parties. But those things of which we disapprove are largely a natural reaction against the oppressive policies of the Government. To deport or imprison men, not for overt acts, but for opinions, is as stupid as it is unjust. Recent events make it abundantly clear that the animus of the Government's policy is less fear of force and violence than of any theory which attacks the right of private property. What Miss Best says of the Larkin trial applies more or less to all similar cases.

"NO one but a being who has crossed the horizon from sanity to insanity would dream of physical force to remove someone out of his path; but this insane criminal act is done today advisedly, consciously, and with malice aforethought by the organized governments of the world."

This is the charge flung back by James Larkin, the Irish labor leader, at the Government which arrested and tried him on a charge of criminal anarchy. "Try and keep a straight face no matter how ridiculous the questions may seem," the Court admonished a witness. Indeed, it requires facial control to hear a Government that maintains itself by barbarous forms of force and violence sentencing to hard labor a few earnest (and perhaps mistaken) enthusiasts because it fears they may some day use in their own behalf what their government has taught them. The great question is, can any government spend its time and money in the nurture of force and violence and be sure of a monopoly on the product?

"OR ANY UNLAWFUL MEANS"

The Criminal Anarchy law is a study in human forethought and ingenuity. It was passed after the assassination of McKinley to prevent madmen from overthrowing our government by killing its officials. There had always been law enough to warn anybody that it was unwise to assassinate anybody else. But the astute minds that steer our destinies must have suspected that worms turn, and in passing a new law they were able to slip in the four fateful words, "or any unlawful means," after the force-and-violence-clause. These words look innocent enough until you see them in action; but if they continue on their course unchallenged they will do more to plunge this country into force and violence than all Attorney General Palmer's pet plotters. For instance, in *The State of New York vs. James Larkin* the prisoner demanded that the Court rule that means not prohibited by law were lawful; but the judge, a long-headed gentleman from the wooden-nutmeg state, ruled instead that means not permitted by law were unlawful.

The outstanding wonder of these New York criminal-anarchy trials is that there isn't a scrap of evidence to show that any of the prisoners either

had murdered or intended to murder anybody, or to incite his fellows to such an act. What, then, is it all about? The Divine Right of private property. Two thousand years ago the charge was, "He stirreth up the people." Those identical words were used unconsciously by the Assistant District Attorney of the State of New York in his charge against James Larkin. In the olden time, the people were stirred up against the Divine Right of the priesthood, later against the Divine Right of kings, and today against the Divine Right of property. You may today blaspheme the Holy One and curse the king outside your bedchamber, but those who have questioned the right of the industrial barons over the lives of the workers are Criminal Anarchists, and liable to ten years at hard labor. This is the twentieth century heresy.

Listen to the court proceedings. The prisoner stated that under his plan only productive workers—by brain or brawn—would have a vote.

The Court: "You say that communism is an economic theory. Has it ever been tried in practice?"

The Defendant: "It was tried in Judaea. The Christian Church for three centuries . . ."

Now the judge was a pious man and had pointedly rebuked the prisoner in the presence of the jury what he considered near-blasphemy. He quietly brushed away the Judæan episode as irrelevant in a court of law. Again he asked for a practical example.

The Defendant: "My own country [Ireland] was communal before the English conquest."

The judge pondered, and then soared on wings of imagination into this hypothetical case: Suppose a man worked hard, saved, invested in a house, rented all of it but one room, in which, contentedly ensconced, he received tribute from his tenants.

The Court: "Do you mean to say that under communism he would be deprived of his vote because at that time he was not a productive worker, even though he had got his property by hard labor?"

The Defendant: "Your Honor, no man ever got property by hard labor alone."

A gentle breeze of amusement rustled through the jury down into the visitors' benches. But the judge, shocked "that people should laugh at such an answer," threatened to empty the room.

Then the traditional community pig worried the Court considerably. Speaking of Ireland under communism:

The Court: "And a man could not kill his own pig?"

The Defendant: "You don't understand, Your Honor. He didn't own the pig. It was a community pig, and the community decided when to kill it, or maybe would they kill a sheep."

The Court, as it were, watched that pig escape into the bogs of communism and gave it up.

EXHIBIT A—THE WINNIPEG STRIKE

Apart from the Communist Manifesto, the star witness for the State was the Winnipeg strike. The State was able to drag that in with bells on because the accused had sent a telegram to the Canadian workers, who were conducting an eminently peaceful strike. The State of New York, in the person of the Assistant District Attorney, plead with the jury in a voice dripping with emotion to consider that awful spectacle. Assuming the rôle of a wicked striker, he ground out between his teeth in the guttural of the stage pirate, "Surrender or we'll starve yeh." The State was long on emotion, short on fact, and very soporific. He managed to convey the impression that infant Winnipeg gave up the ghost gasping for milk, and faces of strong men in the jury set as those innocents were consigned to a milkless grave. Then the State, according to forensic custom, took a sudden far-away flight until the jury had forgotten the babes, when he returned to the milk-on-strike again and accused it of no less heinous a crime than usurping the functions of government, shaking society to its subterranean foundations. . . . Not a drop of milk, Gentlemen of the Jury, could enter the city of Winnipeg without a striker's license. . . . It was all clear now: those heroic babes had died choosing rather to suffer the snuffing out of their little lives than to live dishonored, condoning Criminal Anarchy by absorbing nutriment on a strikers' license. As a matter of fact (of which there is little in a criminal-anarchy trial), the State's star witness had testified that the strikers allowed no *cream* to be delivered.

But most astonishing of all to the average unlegal intelligence, this Winnipeg witness, borrowed from a sister government also shaking with terror of a change, had testified that the Winnipeg strike had been carried on without any violence except one exchange of brickbats (such as occurs in every big city every day), and that private citizens were allowed to man the waterworks without interference from the strikers. The judge asked how the strike was finally ended. Came the answer: "By the Mayor of Winnipeg's calling out the armed forces of the government against unarmed strikers." And such testimony as this has helped to send two young and, if you like, foolish boys besides Jim Larkin to Sing Sing for ten years on a suspicion of intending to use force and violence.

The most startling contrast in the whole trial was that between the prisoner at the bar, who owned to three years' education in a poverty-stricken slum school, and the District Attorney, who boasted proudly and with profound gratitude that the United States had educated him free of charge. The exhibit was an unfortunate one for the Government. The Assistant District Attorney, indeed, admitted the discrepancy himself when he assured the jury: "This prisoner can handle himself better than you or I."

The Court allowed each side three hours in which to sum up. In order not to waste those three hours, it was necessary for the State to say the same things over and over. He admitted asking the prisoner the same question fifteen times. The prisoner, on the other hand, went at the jury like water over Niagara. Briefly as may be, this is what he said after telling how as a child of seven he had worked half time, and at nine years full time:

JIM LARKIN SUMS UP

"The defendant is not getting tried for an overt act; he is getting tried for focusing within his own mind the ideas of the centuries and trying to bring knowledge into a coördinate form that he might assist to develop and beautify life. I found my country [Ireland] steeped in poverty, ignorance, and unemployment, and I set myself the task of trying to bring life and love and beauty into that country. For three years in a poverty-stricken school I was taught the truths of eternal justice, that the fear of God was a true and living thing that ought to cover all my days and control all my actions. Then I had to go out into the world and found that there was no fatherhood of God and no brotherhood of man, but every man was compelled to be like a wolf or a hyena trying to tear down the other man that he might gain advantage by his sorrow, or, more important, the sorrow of his woman, his children. I saw shame brought on the English people by the oppression of the Irish people. What is the English worker getting out of it? Poverty, misery, and eternal damnation. I saw women of our class, daughters of the poor, selling their bodies to lustful brutes that they might eat bread. I saw these women controlled and exploited by the forces that ruled the city of Liverpool."

Suddenly there came before the prisoner a picture, and he tried to make the jury see it: a cellar below a cellar in the Liverpool slums. Following a cry of distress, the prisoner came on the body of a dead woman in that dark underground hole, and a moaning baby trying to nurse at her dead breast. Other children lay in the darkness. The street was called "Christian," in a Christian city; and it was this Christian civilization which the State was trying to protect from the force and violence of the ideas held by the prisoner.

Then once more the prisoner flung himself with force and violence at the State:

"I have been a man who abhorred violence because I have been brutally abused by this organized force [the Government]. I am a man who has engaged officially in peace propaganda for years. Who are these cowardly men who can only live by conservatism and applied force and violence, who bring armed men through the streets and charge you with certain things and then by force and violence bring you here—the men not capable of arguing their case in the open forum, with educational bodies or with people of ideas?"

The State talked long in summing up for the jury and said little, but there were one or two things which must have startled any intelligent listener.

"You cannot," he confessed, "discuss economic theories with one of that class because they beat you every time."

"These men," he cried, "are not fighting for higher wages, they are not fighting for shorter hours, they are not fighting for personal interests."

Ah, Mr. District Attorney—at last, in the language of the street, you said it! The fight is world-wide, and the battle is the one for which every battle has been waged since fighting began: power. These men are now fighting for power over their own lives. Another class now holds that power, and as the power of the worker increases the power of property must diminish. This is the real conflict; the rest is dust in the eyes.

James Larkin has joined his comrades in Sing Sing for ten years.

His Majesty King Oil

MODERN industry is increasingly dependent upon petroleum. Already the oil engine has revolutionized commerce. It follows that to get empire means to control oil. The British know it. Their business men and officials have boasted, "If we secure the supplies of oil now available in the world we can do what we like." Says an able editorial in *The Nation* (May 15th): "The trouble for American vessels is in the British-owned oiling stations dotted around the globe. An American tanker limps in on a thirsty boiler to a British base, and learns that they are regretfully out of supplies. Three hours later, a British tanker makes the sign of the indigent, and receives all the comforts of home." All of which sheds light on a little colloquy between Franklin K. Lane, ex-Secretary of the Interior, and Chairman Fall of the Senate's Committee on Mexican Affairs. "Mr. Lane said there was tremendous need for fuel oil in the United States, and that shortages already were here.

"We have got to get an outside supply of oil for the development of the United States," said he, remarking that England "had been remarkably foresighted and forehanded in oil development all over the world."

"Chairman Fall, citing English oil exploitation in

Asia Minor, asked Mr. Lane if he thought that was a 'menace.'

"Not if Americans develop oil laying around the borders of the Caribbean Sea, as the English are developing around the south end of the Mediterranean Sea," was the response."

But the trouble is, as our investors see it, that our Government does not hack business as it ought—as, in fact, the British Government does. Even around the Caribbean, English companies have staked out the best fields. Our enormous supremacy in oil production demands a vigorous foreign policy if it is to be maintained.

Such is the situation. From Mesopotamia to Mexico, therefore, oil is king and to oil may be sacrificed hecatombs of young men, first in the little wars in Asia Minor, then in Mexico, at last in the great clash between the rival empires. To avert this peril, *The Nation* suggests "international control and rationing" of the raw material. The suggestion is good, though it is difficult to see how it can be attained so long as the fierce competition for profit is the dominant note in all industry.

To Our Readers

COSTS of publication make it imperative that the price of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* be raised to \$1.50. This increase will go into effect with the July issue; subscriptions received up to June 15 will be at the old rate. The Board is desirous of keeping the price down and has not taken this step lightly but only after consultation with Cooperators and other readers to whom our thanks are due for their thoughtful and helpful answers.

While it is hoped that mounting costs will not immediately overtake this increase in the price, it must be remembered that it will be many months before we are beneficiaries of its aid and that under any circumstances we shall need to maintain our Guarantee Fund. As we have already informed our readers through circular letters, the very life of the magazine depends upon our being assured promptly of \$5,000 not now in sight. A generous response is coming from some readers, but we are by no means out of the woods. Whether or not we can continue depends upon what response is made to our appeal before our next issue. We are much heartened, however, by the strong family feeling that is evidenced by the responses to our letters.

But there is one point at which we have been disappointed. Judging by the interest awakened in England by a stockholders' statement, we had expected a more wide-spread response to our Challenge to Stockholders. Outside of the Board of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* only 23 have signified a desire to sign. We do not feel justified in pressing the matter further, but we shall be glad to turn over the correspondence to any of the signatories who may desire to keep the movement alive.

The French Woman and the Home

By MARY KELSEY

IT was in July, 1918, at the time of the last desperate German offensive, that the civil authorities of Calvados in Normandy sent to the Quakers to ask for assistance in the difficult problem which the new influx of refugees had brought to them.

Investigation brought to light terrible conditions of over-crowding, under-feeding, and insanitation, and when our little group of four started on our work of relief we found ourselves almost overwhelmed. It seemed strange to find in the prosperous town where we established our headquarters only three French women who were actively exerting themselves to relieve conditions, dangerous not only to the refugees, but to the townsfolk as well.

We met the well-to-do socially, but in our work practically not at all. Before our arrival three women had exerted themselves notably, two school-teachers and the wife of the local veterinary. Their work and devotion had been beyond praise, but they were worn out after four years of unceasing struggle, and no one had appeared to relieve them among their own compatriots.

I never ceased feeling myself an interloper, and every time the keys of the *Mairie* where our *vestièr*e was established were put unquestioningly into my hands, or when I was stopped in the street, as happened almost daily, by clamoring refugees, or was appealed to by wealthy residents of the town asking help for others, I found myself saying inwardly, "What on earth am I doing here?"

But the French seemed in no way to share my feelings. One day in a gay suburban villa where I was calling on the charming wife of the commander of the local military forces, the little lady showed me proudly a beautiful table-cover which she was elaborately embroidering with Italian cut-work and insets. "What wonderful work," I said; "how can you ever attempt such a thing?" She laughed pleasantly. "One must fill one's time somehow," she said.

It seemed unbelievable, but with certain notable exceptions, almost entirely confined to the higher aristocracy, the attitude of mind expressed by my genial little hostess was representative of that of the great majority of the well-to-do French women throughout the war. It troubled me greatly. I liked the French who in every class had opened their doors with cordial hospitality to us, and in many ways I found myself warmly sympathetic with them. I knew that the women of England had thrown themselves with extraordinary zeal and energy into the manifold and difficult tasks which the war had imposed upon their country, and I knew how whole-heartedly the women of America had dedicated themselves to the same end. But in France, bleeding to death under the scourge of the invader, the home life of the women, except in so far as it had to adjust itself to the cruel wrench due to the death or absence of the men, went on as usual.

And such a home life! I had to admit that never in America had I seen its equal for unity and sweet domestic peace, and the common enjoyment of the simple pleasures which existing conditions permitted.

THE BEAUTY OF FRENCH HOME LIFE

It was an unending pleasure to enter a French home and to note the obvious harmony in which the old grandmother lived with the daughter-in-law and the affectionate, attentive grandchildren. It was charming to see the really important rôle accorded to the children trained from babyhood to the responsibilities of host and hostess. In the richest houses the baby would be brought down as a matter of course from the nursery to welcome the visitor, and the children would be summoned from the school-room. It was taken for granted that the call was intended for the whole family. The various generations seemed to get immense pleasure from each other. I remember being one day ushered into a charming salon where the elderly *père-de-famille*, surrounded by his family (including a feeble-minded old aunt, never banished from the hearth), was roasting chestnuts in the handsome fireplace with evident delight. And the friendly relations existing between servants and their mistresses was an endless marvel to me. I never saw any expression of the sense either of inferiority or superiority, whether of age, sex, or worldly status. France is certainly the most democratic country in the world.

I remember the words of an American soldier with whom I talked one day in a tram-car where I accidentally met him. "We don't know anything about home-life in America," he said. "I'm not at home two nights in a year. We don't know how to enjoy each other. The French can put it all over us as far as their life at home goes."

I agreed with him perfectly, and after much thought I concluded that it was to this very merit, carried a little too far, that the well-to-do French woman's failure to do her share in the terrible emergency of the war was due.

THE EXPLANATION FOR LACK OF PUBLIC SPIRIT.

I had heard the indifference of the French bourgeoisie spoken of many times with resentment by the English and American women who were toiling to relieve the situation in a foreign country. It really did seem extraordinary for the authorities of Calvados to have called in strangers to their help, in a town filled with rich and, except for the duties incident to the care of their own homes, unoccupied French women.

I talked it all over one day with a much-traveled French woman, a master of perfect English, and a true cosmopolitan. I think that together we probably reached the solution of the problem.

Before the war, except in great industrial centers there had been practically no poverty in France. The French habits of hard work and thrift had

produced an extraordinarily high level of prosperity. It was a most exceptional family that did not live in substantial comfort. I remember my amazement on first making the acquaintance of French peasant interiors out of the war zone. I found beautiful old carved furniture, stores of embroidered linen that few wealthy houses in America could equal, and beds and bedding such as I had never seen before. The food was plentiful and exceedingly well cooked. I doubt if any working people in the world lived as well as the French before the war. And so far as my own experience went this was practically universal, though I must admit that with the high standard of material comfort went an appalling ignorance of, and indifference to, sanitation.

The glaring poverty which has been produced in certain sections of America by the over-crowding and the exploiting of the immigrant was unknown in France, as was also that blot on England's economic life, the enormous class of unemployables, the remote result of her mistaken system of land tenure in combination with the benighted poor-laws that have for so long been her curse.

Both England and America have had to struggle with a problem of poverty which had been unknown in France since the Revolution released the land to the people. In self-defense we have created an army of social-workers and built up our schools of social science and the vast network of charitable institutions which at the best are a doubtful blessing to our country. Until the unparalleled catastrophe of the war, when many hundreds of thousands of self-supporting people were driven from their homes and deprived of their work, there had never been the need for the system of relief in France long ago adopted by England and by America from pure necessity.

When the emergency came, the French woman, used to the cloistered seclusion of her home, impregnated with the conviction that woman's proper sphere was the home, was not even theoretically ready to meet it, nor did four years of war change her mental attitude.

The social problem produced by the war never seemed to the French woman, broadly speaking, one that had any personal bearing. Her duty lay in the beloved and exquisitely tended home. Beyond the rigidly locked gate of the gay little garden her responsibility ceased. One may truly say, I think, that for the women of France public spirit has scarcely yet been born.

THE SACRAMENT OF COMMON THINGS

But her home is a sacred thing, its care a true vocation. I remember once speaking to a well-to-do refugee woman whose passionate grief at the loss of her home went to my heart. She had spoken of the embroidered linens over which she and her mother had toiled together, the ancestral furniture, treasured through generations, and all the dear and cherished possessions that had helped to make up her home. "I never realized before what chairs and tables might mean," I said. "They are in a sense sacramental—the outward and visible sign of

an invisible and spiritual grace." She seized my hand while the tears gushed from her eyes. "You understand," she said.

And to us who were working among their suffering compatriots the French women always accorded the warmest and most generous admiration. I have seen the tears on their lashes many times as they spoke of our service with amazement as at an enormous and heroic sacrifice—as one might speak of a Father Damien, immolating himself voluntarily in a terrible work of mercy. They expressed themselves always in the same words: "What devotion! To leave your homes!" We could never explain that to us the work was a commonplace duty, and that incidentally we were getting a great deal of pleasure from it. We had left our homes from our free choice. To the French our work was pure sacrifice, a marvelous act of supererogation.

MUTUAL MISUNDERSTANDING

The seclusion of the French woman acted without doubt in another way to the disadvantage of her country. When France was suddenly inundated by the American army, full of sympathy for the French and eager for the friendship of the people for whose succor they were offering their lives, the doors of the French provincial homes were no more opened to the soldier than they had been to the refugees. In this instance, however, it was contrary to the inclination of the women, who were always delighted when through proper conventional channels the Americans could be introduced into their homes. But they, as well as their husbands, were bound by the rigid French social law by which the older resident waits to be called upon by the new-comer—a complete reversal of the American system, which bound the American with equal force.

I remember a young officer from Virginia speaking of the French inhospitality with amazement and bitterness. "At home," he said, "if a regiment of foreign soldiers had come to visit us we'd have fallen all over ourselves to entertain them. Here we can see no one but the working people." Except through official introductions, the forty thousand Americans who were quartered in or near that provincial French town were almost entirely denied acquaintance with the many well-to-do French families about them. That to welcome their allies might be a patriotic duty never occurred to the unofficial French mind.

The unforeseen results of this misunderstanding were appalling. If the Americans were denied the privilege of associating with well-bred French women, no restriction prevented their making the acquaintance of women of another type. Many and many an American boy has returned to his country with the sincere conviction that all French women are disreputable. "You can't think of the things they talk about," they used to say to me. "No decent American girl speaks of the things that all the French girls laugh at." The logical result of this most unfortunate impression was often insufferable insolence on the part of the Americans to French women whom they met accidentally in trains or on the street, and whom they treated as they were

used to treating the women with whom they were free to associate. This was one of the contributing causes of the antagonism which sprang up in France towards the Americans and which became so acute after the armistice. "*Ils sont trop sans gêne*" a young French officer once said gravely to me in speaking of the American soldiers and their loss of popularity among the French. I had to admit what with my own eyes I saw to be true, but I could not help feeling that it was not only the Americans who were to blame.

"LAWS ARE MADE TO BE BROKEN"

It cannot be denied that lack of public spirit in France has resulted in a disregard for law which is startling. To obey the law in the interests of the community, no matter at what inconvenience to oneself,—the Anglo-Saxon ideal,—is an unimaginable thing in France. It is for the family, not society at large, that the French exert themselves. All laws relating to food regulation, the use of public utilities, and all the irksome limitations imposed by the war, were constantly violated by practically all the French, including officials, and obviously with no sense of wrong-doing. I remember one flagrant instance.

The problem of illumination was an exceedingly difficult one during the long evenings of the winter of '18 and '19. Kerosene was limited to one litre—about a pint and a half—per family per month, and it was often unobtainable even in that quantity. Many houses were of course unprovided with gas; and illumination by exceedingly expensive candle-light, or to bed with the chickens, was the alternative in thousands of families.

In Calvados our next-door neighbors were a family of wealthy, educated, and delightful refugees from Arras, quite removed from our sphere of relief activity. The elderly lady who was the head of the family had for months heroically remained under the deadly bombardment of the enemy, at the special request of the *Prefet*, in order that the flour-mill of which she was the owner might continue to operate and the bakeries of Arras receive from it their daily supply of flour. One day a shell burst in a group of French soldiers who were sitting on the steps of her house and eight of the men were blown in pieces through the shattered door. She and her daughter had later gone about with a tablecloth gathering up fragments of human flesh still warm. Their courage was magnificent.

One day this charming lady came to me with a startling request. As an organization for charity we were not limited in the quantity of kerosene which we were permitted to buy. We made application to the *Sous-Prefet* for what we needed, he gave us a special permit, and if the shops supplied the kerosene we were entitled to buy what we required. The Arras lady had gone to the *Sous-Prefet* and asked him to make an exception of her also; but in her case there could be no reason for so doing other than that of her wealth—an unsatisfactory basis for exceptions in the distribution of the necessities of life. This the *Sous-Prefet* explained adding, however, that we, her neighbors, were permitted an unlimited allowance of kerosene. "Ask them," he said, "to add the quantity that

you require to their demand, and you can get it from them."

As to the evil of the lack of public spirit which makes such an attitude towards law possible there can be no debate. France, without doubt, needs educating in obligation towards the community. Perhaps America is equally in need of education in the obligation towards the home.

Which Road for Our Children?

TWO French documents furnish a contrast in ideals of life and methods of education which is not peculiar to France. The first is a poster which a correspondent writes us has been widely displayed in the public schools of France since the signing of the armistice. It reads:

"The Germans have broken their honorable engagements.

They have desired the war and inundated France with their spies.

They wished to reduce the world to slavery.

They wished to organize civil war and revolution in the countries of their enemies.

They have reduced the invaded populations to slavery.

They have placed women and children in front of their troops.

They have pillaged, stolen, burned, massacred the wounded. Tortured prisoners, bombarded hospitals, assassinated civilians, mutilated children.

They have invaded France five times during 125 years."

The second is Anatole France's famous address to the recent Congress of teachers. We quote two paragraphs:

"You have before you the stupendous task of completely revolutionizing primary education from the bottom up. It is a need that is little understood, and in whose accomplishment you will find neither sympathy nor support. The end must be to produce workers; for in our modern society there is no place for idle folk. You alone can prepare people for the work they have to do; you alone can give them an understanding of their duty to humanity.

"Burn, therefore, the old books which teach hatred! Let us destroy the last one, and turn with all our hearts to teaching the new doctrines of labor and love. Let us mold a new race of men capable of resisting the temptations of a life of barbarous splendor and ease, a life that led inevitably to the imperialism of national rivalry which has so utterly wrecked the present generation. Away with industrial rivalry as well! Let us go to work, and Peace will reign supreme."

Which spirit is to prevail in the training of the children not of France only but of America and of every land? It is a vital question. THE WORLD TOMORROW invites correspondence from parents and teachers on the situation in our own schools. We want authentic information not only as to the widespread propaganda of jingoism, hate, and intolerance, but as to constructive efforts to train children in "an understanding of their duty to humanity."

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

A Single-Taxer Answers Dr. Cadbury

I DON'T think you put enough emphasis, in your reply to Dr. Cadbury's fine article, on the positive coercion the man who remains-at-work-during-a-strike is guilty of. Either workers are entitled to a share in the output (wages) or they have no right. If they have a right, then those who oppose them—master or serf—are in the wrong. 'Tis a nice question, of both principle and degree.

Further on Dr. Cadbury likens a strike to a blockade. I think the term blockade has blinded him to the effort needed to enforce the stoppage of traffic. A blockade is not a voluntary boycott similar to a strike; it is an act of war similar to any other form of raid on the enemy's food-supplies, etc.

Of course as a Singletaxer I think we as Society are to blame by handing over our economic privileges to individuals. To those who think slightly of my reason I will point out that it is the enormous multiplication of infinitesimal sources which makes disease of danger to us.

JOHN BUCHANAN.

Berwick, Nova Scotia.

It is the Industrial System that is Coercive

IT seems to me that Mr. Cadbury, in his analogy between the economic blockade and the strike, ignored a vital point which you also overlooked. Strikers voluntarily lay down their tools, refusing longer to submit to the coercion which forces them to patiently endure being robbed of so much of their work that life becomes unbearable. But the blockade is not a voluntary suspension of trade by the traders; it is a coercive act of governments, prohibiting traders from trading. There is, therefore, no analogy between the strike and the economic blockade.

I am not a defender of strikes, for the reason that I have something better to offer, something which I consider a sovereign remedy for the evils which breed strikes. The strike is the last desperate stand of a victim crowded to the wall. I believe that it is possible to educate people to desire and to adopt *Equitable Exchange*. That would be the end of all kinds of exploitation. Meanwhile, I do not believe in depriving the industrial slaves of their last weapon of defense, nor in assuming that the strike is even as coercive as the system which robs the worker.

W. E. BROKAW.

Bay View, Washington.

The Strike a Release from Industrial Warfare

OUR present system of industry is war, continuous, relentless, and calamitous beyond even the horrors of what is commonly called war. Therefore the burden of proof is not upon the pacifist who justifies a strike, that is, a temporary cessation of this warfare, for the purpose of ameliorating it; but the burden of proof is upon the pacifist who justifies any participation at all in our industrial cannibalism and slaughter of our fellows. It is only by ignoring the actual

character of our industrial life, which a California business man, not a Socialist, described as "every man with his fingers at his brother's throat," or by insisting upon the favorite doctrine of militarism, necessity, that we pacifists can justify ourselves in working under the system at all. Strikes, therefore, are but occasional intervals of a rational and moral severance of ourselves from a system in which we have neither rational nor moral right to participate at all. How can a consistent pacifist justify himself in taking part at any time in our system of chronic industrial war, which is just what ordinary business is?

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Los Gatos, California.

The Conscientious Objector Also Is a Striker

Dear Henry Cadbury:

YOU say that "the strike, however bloodless, is to a large extent a method of coercion," and "not coercion but conversion" is God's way.

But if you refuse to fight and persuade some thousands of others to resist conscription with you are you not coercing the governments? Surely the conscientious objector, whom you support, is a striker. You cannot cling to the one method and throw away the other where questions of moral right are involved.

You may sometimes bring conversion by means of quiet coercion in cases where the government of employers wish to coerce an individual or a group to do wrong.

To kill is wrong; hence the Conscientious Objector is right. To work for soul-killing hours and wages is wrong; therefore the striker is often right.

Which, then, will you do—give up being a Conscientious Objector and urging others to join you if we should declare war against Mexico, or support the Steel Strikers so long as their leaders urge and maintain non-violent methods?

ELEANOR WOOD WHITMAN.

Boston.

A Liberal Ex-Soldiers' Organization

I WOULD like to bring to your attention the good work that is being done in organizing liberal minded ex-service men for defense of old-time American rights and civil liberties by the World War Veterans, Lester P. Barlow, chairman, 314 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

Since its organization in November, 1918, the World War Veterans has had an unprecedented growth in spite of the absence of large Wall Street loans and munificent donations from so-called charitable institutions. There are now 63 posts in Minnesota, 31 in South Dakota, 11 in Montana, and 7 in Wisconsin. The total membership is now 125,000, and from the northwest the movement is spreading over the entire country.

The platform of the World War Veterans denounces compulsory military training and demands free speech and free assemblage. Their slogan is "*The Enforcement of the Constitution of the United States as it is Written*," and they have taken a determined stand against mobs and violence. The organization has received the endorsement of the State Federations of Labor in Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

To allow for the cooperation of forward-looking civilians in attaining the objects of the society, the World War Veterans Auxiliary has been organized. Any civilian, man or woman, can become a member of the Auxiliary by remitting \$1.00 to headquarters.

No veteran of the great war who has the interest of his country at heart and wants to make it safe for democracy can afford to remain apart from his comrades now organized for collective action in the World War Veterans. The sum of \$1.00 sent to the Minneapolis headquarters will pay the initiation fee of a veteran as a member-at-large, pay his dues for two months, and buy the badge of the Organization.

In communities where ten or more veterans can be gotten together, \$5.00 will pay the fee for a charter, and a local post of the World War Veterans can be organized.

C. O. PARSONS,

Bus. Rep., World War Veterans, Inc.

State Headquarters

World War Veterans

314 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

"The Reminder of the Life"

THINGS seem to be in a deadlock here in China now. Japan continues to press for every possible advantage in the game of gobbling up China. Yet by pressing her militaristic policy she is gaining the lasting hatred of the Chinese. Every new outrage means an actual loss of thousands of dollars to Japan, because each such occurrence gives new impetus to the patriotic Chinese who are pushing the boycott against Japan. Of course it is to just this that the Japanese Imperialists are blind. Had they been content with "peaceful penetration," foregoing the desire for territorial expansion and treating the Chinese as equals, the Japanese could undoubtedly have gained the strongest position of any nation in China.

Instead of that, they are making a bitter enemy. The students and business men are now pretty well organized all over the country, and by means of public meetings, street parades, and other peaceful methods of demonstration, publicity is given to each move of the Japanese and Peking Militarists. Just recently the Government has made a new show of force against these peaceful demonstrators, and Peking is practically under martial law. The great mass meeting here in Hankow was carried through in the face of the Governor's prohibition, and in spite of the armed soldiers, who were powerless in trying to disperse the thousands of people who came.

What is going to come of it all? It may be that the Japanese aggression will prove to be the only means great enough to sting the Chinese nation into new life. The most discouraging thing out here, for those of us working with the Chinese, is the dead lethargy that

hangs like a cloud over the whole people. You sometimes feel you would welcome anything that would wake these people up. They seem so content to drift along in their dirty, messy ways, perfectly content if they get their bowl of rice and a hovel to sleep in. They have not yet waked up, despite all you hear to the contrary. There have been some great changes, but most of these changes have touched only a few thousands out of the masses. China's millions go on as before, totally oblivious of politics and the great world outside.

In the meantime, America remains the hope of the world, and the place of greatest crisis. If she can find her soul, these other nations will certainly follow her example. If she tramples down her laborers, and undertakes a new war at the behest of Capital, all the missionaries out here will preach Christ in vain. President Wilson once said, "The reminder of the life is worth a thousand times the suggestion of the pulpit." That holds true for nations as for individuals.

R. B. COLSON.

China.

Another Call to Opponents of Militarism

Here is a letter which ought to arouse our readers. It comes from Charles T. Hallinan, Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism. "The Wadsworth Army Re-organization Bill is now in a Conference Committee made up of representatives of both houses. It will probably be there for some weeks because the two Houses differ very radically in their conception of what the act should provide. I have been considerably disconcerted to see how little effect we seem to have made on the country in connection with Section 73 (now changed to Section 69), which provides for conscription of all males between eighteen and forty-five whenever a national emergency is declared to exist. I dropped in on a number of Congressmen yesterday and could not find one who had received a single letter from a constituent on the subject. The labor movement is absolutely asleep.

"The military training provision, of course, goes over until next December, when the lame ducks and the victorious Congressmen will have a chance to consider it 'on its merits' and free from the unfair coercion of public opinion."

Surely our readers will want no further exhortation to bring all possible pressure to bear upon their Congressmen. If Section 69, as it now stands, passes we would need no subsequent legislation either to get a conscript army to invade Mexico or to break strikes by the device so well known in France of declaring a national emergency and calling the men to the colors.

Ex Libris

Anton Chekhov, Reporter of Life

The Letters of Anton Chekhov.

The Bishop and Other Stories. By Anton Chekhov.

The Chorus Girl and Other Stories. By Anton Chekhov.

Translated by Constance Garnett. (The Macmillan Co.)

QUITE different from the hide-bound and standardized type of average American short stories are the tales of Anton Chekhov. Plot, suspense, surprise, punch—in the stories of the Russian these fetishes, set up by magazine editors, worshiped by the public, and taught in correspondence courses, do not exist. To Chekhov as artist the short story is a medium for setting forth life as it is, in all its complexity; and life as it is does not readily yield to the demands of plot and punch. It is too fluid, vague, incomprehensible. So to the average American reader, probably, Chekhov is dull stuff.

But when you have become habituated to him, there is something in his tales that gets very deeply under your skin and sometimes leaves you, when you have finished a story, at the wilting point emotionally. You feel as though you had become intensively acquainted with a human soul, sharing its agonies, joys, tribulations, and seeing through its hypocrisies and layers of social veneer to the deep-lying elements of humanity beneath. Brief though the span of time may be in months, days, or hours during which you are permitted to know and talk with the characters, Chekhov manages to reveal to you a panorama of the life of each one—not exaggerated, with high spots touched up, but a life as it is lived, deep and poignant. In the best of the tales, perhaps, tragedy lurks: tragedy of character, of environment, of thwarted dreams, of emotions twisted into wrong channels: but it is the sort of tragedy which gives you not despair but a larger understanding and a deeper appreciation of the underlying nobility of human beings. The tales are what is called "realistic"; not much is glozed over, nor is there any attempt to prettify ugliness. But the essential healthiness of Chekhov's mind led him wide of that particular muck-heap in which De Maupassant delighted to delve, and his passionate human sympathy relieves his realism of the cynical.

Of these three books, *The Bishop* is solid good reading, concerned largely with aspects of Russia's religious life. *The Chorus Girl* contains two or three pot-boilers among a number of gems. *The Letters* (including a biography) reveal Chekhov's life and character as you would never get it from his stories.

A man of courage against great physical and financial odds, of extraordinary sympathy, and of almost unbelievable activity, much of it wholly unselfish, Chekhov was, as he himself says: "not a liberal, not a conservative, not a believer in gradual progress, not a monk, not an indifferentist. I should like to be a free artist and nothing more. I hate lying and violence in all forms. Pharisaism, stupidity, and despotism reign not in merchants' houses and prisons alone. That is why I have no preference either for gendarmes, or for butchers, or for scientists, or for writers, or for the younger generation. I regard trade-marks and labels

as a superstition. My holy of holies is the human body, health, intelligence, talent, inspiration, love, and the most absolute freedom—freedom from violence and lying, whatever forms they may take. This is the program I would follow if I were a great artist."

Chekhov's stories are a mine in which, with some dross, run veins of the pure gold of life. But do not seek here for propaganda. "You are right," says Chekhov to a correspondent, "in demanding that an artist should take an intelligent attitude to his work, but you confuse two things: *solving a problem* and *stating a problem correctly*. It is only the second that is obligatory for the artist. In *Anno Korovin* and *Ergeny Onyegin* not a single problem is solved, but they satisfy you completely because all the problems are correctly stated in them." G. H.

Two Hammer Blows at War

The Judgment of Peace. By Andreas Latzko. (Boni and Liveright.)

Now It Can Be Told. By Philip Gibbs. (Harper and Brothers.)

LATZKO'S novel sears the reader with its flaming indignation. It is a series of white-hot pictures: of life in the training barracks, where men writhe under the galling discipline of regular-army non-coms.; of brief leaves at home, unutterably poignant; of the night before going into the trenches, with loaded carts of gruesomely torn and shattered bodies pouring into the little town; of the charge, with cultured men reverting to brute savagery and doing butcher work for their very lives; of many conversations in which are compressed into hot words what peaceful-minded men and women have thought during five years of war. All of the chief characters are people of sensitiveness and intelligence, on whom the war made its sharpest reaction, and who may therefore be said to have plumbed the depths of spiritual suffering from the inhumanity of war.

"It is hard, I tell you," says Gadsby, the musician and aristocrat, "to pity man. For no animal can be so ferocious. The beasts slay only from hunger, and then but rarely members of their own species. Man alone is capable of that joy in the hurt of others, and in inflicting upon others what he most dreads himself."

"I do not believe," says Ensign von Krulow on the eve of battle, "that there are any circumstances which can make it honorable to pierce the bodies of men with bayonets or bullets. And I do not believe that anyone has the right to require that of me. All that anyone can ask is that I should die rather than give up my faith. And that I shall do. I shall not kill! I will neither stab nor shoot. For the fact that other and sorely misguided men will seek to take my life is no reason for me to yield to the same madness."

And Gadsby, thinking of those who had it in their power to stop the war by saying a word, and yet did not say that word for interminable years: "He could not help repeating this thought, for it seemed to him the most monstrous thought in the world. Yes, there were men who could give life to millions, could save those already quivering on the edge of the abyss, could work

this unspeakable miracle, and refrained. They were quite calm, and kept their eyes fixed on some quite distant goal which they themselves did not clearly see or understand, and said: 'Until that goal is reached the men at the front must carry on.' It was incredible."

There is much I should like to quote here, passages of fine hope for humanity and passages of despair. But those who believe in Peace should read the book and have those passages in their context.

If *The Judgment of Peace* is a flame, *Now It Can Be Told* is a slow and smoldering fire. Through 350 pages Philip Gibbs has stretched such a panorama of war as has not yet been seen. He has ground out slowly all the bitterness and agony of soul that as a war correspondent working under a vigilant censorship he was forced to keep from the public view during the conflict. Incident is added to incident until there is a wealth of detail, interpreted by the sober reflection of a mind that does not fly into revolt but stores up its energy like a deep river. "I have not painted the picture blacker than it was," he explains, "nor selected gruesome morsels and joined them together to make a jig-saw puzzle. I have tried to set down as many aspects of the war's psychology as I could find in my remembrance of these years, without exaggeration or false emphasis, so that out of their confusion, even out of their contradiction, the real truth of the adventure might be seen as it touched the souls of men."

Gibbs saw all of the war as it was given to only a handful of men to see it—every aspect from English training camp to front-line trench. From this experience he concludes, "Nothing that has been written is more than the pale image of the abomination of those battlefields." The blundering of generals who, following the so-called science of war, sacrificed thousands of brave lads to gain an objective that turns out to be worthless; the pretty panoply of Staff officers in Headquarters behind the lines, while common soldiers lie in stinking trenches under fire miles away; these and a hundred other aspects of war and a thousand scenes from trench and camp and billet appear in his pages with a pitiless scorn for what is cruel and hypocritical and a great admiration for what is heroic. "The heroes of mythology were but paltry figures compared with those who, in the great war, went forward to the roaring devils of modern gun-fire, dwelt amid high explosives more dreadful than dragons, breathed in the fumes of poison-gas more foul than the breath of Medusa, watched and slept above mine-craters which upheaved the bell-fire of Pluto, and defied thunderbolts more certain in death-dealing blows than those of Jove."

Gibbs concludes: "My own belief is that the war was no proof against the Christian faith, but rather is a revelation that we are as desperately in need of the spirit of Christ as at any time in the history of mankind. . . . Some crash must come, tragic and shocking to our social structure. I see no escape from that, and only the hope that in that crisis the very shock of it will restore the mental balance of the nation and that all classes will combine under leaders of unselfish purpose, and fine vision, eager for evolution and not revolution, for peace and not for blood, for Christian charity and not for hatred, for civilization and not for anarchy, to reshape the conditions of our social

life and give us a new working order, with more equality of labor and reward, duty and sacrifice, liberty and discipline of the soul, combining the virtue of patriotism with a generous spirit to other peoples across the frontiers of hate. . . . Let us seek the beauty of life and God's truth somehow, remembering the boys who died too soon, and all the falsity and hatred of those past five years. By blood and passion there will be no healing. We have seen too much blood. We want to wipe it out of our eyes and souls. Let us have Peace."

These books, accepted by mankind, would be sufficient in themselves to end war forever. Will they fall on deaf ears? G. H.

Random Notes on Books

A Short History of the American Labor Movement. By Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

ALL schools of thought will agree on the enormous significance of the labor movement and yet there is almost no popular knowledge of its history in America. Mrs. Mary Beard has tried to lighten our darkness by her *Short History*. The book is so brief and so clearly written that it will not fag the brain even of the tired business man. It is comprehensive in scope and objective in treatment. It gives a clear impression of the ups and downs of a movement which in one form or another goes back to colonial times.

But its value is impaired by the author's laudable desire for brevity. Her book is so general that it gives no sense of the real life and color of the labor movement and but little understanding of the contending philosophies within it. So important a phase of the modern labor movement as the development of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers is not even mentioned. In short, the book is only an interesting outline, and its greatest value may be to create a demand for an adequate history.

National Ideals in the Old Testament. By Henry Cadbury (Charles Scribner's Sons).

HERE is a book of unusual worth in bringing out the value of the Old Testament for our times. Dr. Cadbury accepts the results of modern scholarship in the realm of Old Testament criticism and on the basis of them makes real and living the experiences of the Hebrew people in the working out of their national ideals. He is not afraid to suggest some searching applications of the records of Israel's experience to the social life of our day.

The book includes chapters which have already appeared in *THE WORLD TOMORROW*. Readers who appreciated them in our paper will find they have acquired fresh value in the setting of this book.

New Ventures of Faith. Compiled and edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press).

THIS remarkable little guide for the devotional life first appeared during the war and was reviewed by us at the time. In its revised—and improved—form it is winning a welcome from thousands of Christians who find in it fresh inspiration to pray, largely by reason of its rich suggestions as to the manifold human problems which ought to drive the soul of man to communion with God. N. T.

The Last Page

I AM CONSTANTLY SURPRISING MY FRIENDS BY telling them that I am strongly in favor of the demand for a generous bonus being given to the returned soldier. Indeed I go even further than the most exorbitant Legionary. I would give a bonus to every man who was compelled to register for the draft, though not of course quite so large an amount as I would give to the man who was yanked out of his home and out of his job and yanked off to a far-away camp and into a uniform, and then yanked over the ocean to fight that the Peace-makers might inherit the earth (no wonder our soldiers in Europe were always called Yanks). And, more than that, I would give a special bonus to all who were insulted by arrest and search during the so-called Slacker raids, and then all who snuffered at concerts or in theaters from the infliction of Liberty Loan orators should be remembered. I think all who voted for Mr. Wilson because he had "kept us out of war" should be compensated in some way. And surely a bonus should go to all who suffered moral and intellectual damage from the products of the Government's laboratory of war-truth—this, of course, would include all who fell victims to the official hate propaganda put out in the form of lying newspaper stories of atrocities,—Liberty Loan posters,—moving-picture campaigns, and the like. Yes, but where is all the money to come from, you say. Well, the discharged soldiers in England, Australia and New Zealand give the answer—tax the land values—expropriate the big landlords. Perhaps we may see some day soon great banners across our streets—"You conscripted our lives, now we'll conscript your dollars."

THOSE ENGLISH COUSINS OF OURS WILL BE THE death of me. They are incorrigible. I had an overwhelming experience with one of them the other day. He was a delightful person and we got on together famously. The talk turned to the admirable scheme of purchasing Sulgrave Manor, the old home of the Washington family in England, and turning it into an international shrine. My friend told me that he had lately visited the place. "What especially impressed me," he said, "was the sight of the armorial bearings of the Washington family carved in a great oak beam in the old dining hall. There in those stars and stripes I saw for the first time the origin of your flag, 'old glorious' as you call it. And now," he added impressively, "whenever I see the American flag flying I realize that it represents the ideals of an English country gentleman."

THERE SEEMS TO BE SOMETHING SINGULARLY INAPPROPRIATE in the suggestion that the name and fame of the late Colonel Roosevelt should be commemorated by making his birthday the occasion for a public holiday. For my part almost the last thing I should do to honor the memory of the author of "The Strenuous Life" would be to take a day off from work. In our memorials surely we should have some regard for the fitness of things. Thus when the time comes to honor other of our national heroes, let us try to be true to their ideals and to express them as well as we can. For example, in celebration of Judge Gary's birthday, instead of instituting a national holiday, Congress should pass a law making it compulsory for everybody to work twelve hours on that happy day; and on the anniversary of Mr. John D. Rockefeller's first glimpse of the light who in thankfulness would wish to work less than the full twenty-four hours?

I HAVE LATELY HEARD OF A STRANGE CULT SCATTERED so widely throughout the world that it is credibly reported that the sun never sets on the lands that its members inhabit. The principal item of its faith I am told is that the lost ten tribes of Israel are no other than the well-known English nation and that all the fair promises held out in the Bible to God's chosen people are meant exclusively for the inhabitants of that island which, as their national song asserts, "at Heaven's command arose from out the azure main." This pleasing interpretation of Holy Writ will doubtless derive much aid and comfort from the story of the British soldier who was fired at during the recent rioting in Cairo. Fortunately the bullet was deflected by a small Bible he was carrying in his breast pocket at the time. The cover and the first few pages were all torn away, leaving the seventeenth chapter of Exodus exposed with the words at the top of the page: "Blessed be the Lord who has delivered you out of the hands of the Egyptians."

SPEAKING OF EGYPT REMINDS ME OF A LETTER I SAW the other day which had been received by a British officer in Egypt in answer to an invitation for charcoal for the local barracks:

"To His Excellency the Officer Commanding the British Army:

Sembalawin, April 16.

"Sir,—We are honored to see you in such good spirits. Sir, we have a good charcoal for cooking the British army in payment, Sir, if any of your soldiers want anything you must tell us so that we give you what he want in payment.

"Sir, you Obedient servant,

"K— Y—.

"P S. Thank you, O Lord."

THESE ATTEMPTS THAT ARE BEING MADE, APPARENTLY quite seriously and by reputable men of science, to establish communication with the stars would have interested the poet Tennyson. It is said of him that he regarded the contemplation of the wonders of the heavens as a cure for nervousness and self-consciousness. Thus on one occasion when his younger brother quailed at the prospect of going to a dinner-party at a neighbor's house, the poet advised him "to think of Herschel's star-patches" and he would soon "get over" his timidity. It was Tennyson, too, who on being shown the latest discovery in star-dust exclaimed: "Well, after seeing that one doesn't think so much of the best families."

In this presidential year there are a good many people who might remember, to the advantage of all concerned, that an occasional glance through a good telescope at the spacious firmament on high is a fine cure for over-excitement as to who is to be the next occupant of the White House.

EX-PROOFREADER.

WHAT THEY ARE SAYING IN ENGLAND

"The Socialists present an idea which has been believed in by some of the greatest idealists in the world, and I will never talk about them except with the greatest possible respect."

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE.

"The only purpose for which large armaments are required in Britain today is to repress the people and fight Socialism wherever it may arise in the world."

CHARLES P. TREVELYAN.

Keep your religious thinking abreast of your other thinking

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

A Journal of Religion

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON

and HERBERT L. WILLETT

Editors

IN THESE days of great thinking on world themes, constructive leaders must think greatly on Christian themes. A notable series of brilliant and candid articles by leading American thinkers, covering the entire range of typical present-day opinion from orthodox apologetic to radical criticism, is now appearing in THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY, on the general subject—

"Will the Church Survive?"

The most significant journalistic offering in the history of the American religious press. Among the writers are:

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson	Dr. Shailer Mathews
Dr. Robert E. Speer	Dr. Burris Jenkins
Mr. John Spargo	Dr. Edward Scribner Ames
Dr. Joseph Ernest McAfee	Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Mr. Francis Hackett	Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie
The Hon. Louis F. Post	Mr. Max Eastman
Dr. Graham Taylor	Mr. Carl Sandburg
Prof. Harry F. Ward	Dr. H. D. C. MacLachlan

and others.

The Subscription Price of THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY is Three Dollars a Year. *New Subscribers note two special acquaintance offers in coupons below.*

Acquaintance Subscription to Jan. 1, 1921, \$2.

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
1400 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago.
For the enclosed \$2 please send me THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY, weekly, until Jan. 1, 1921, and a copy of "The Protestant," by Burris Jenkins.

Name

Address

.....

Five Months' Acquaintance Subscription, \$1.

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
1400 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago.
For the enclosed \$1 please send me THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY for a trial period of 5 months (22 issues).

Name

Address

.....

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Now It Can Be Told, Philip Gibbs (Harper)	\$3.00
The Judgment of Peace, A. Laisko (Boal & Liveright)	1.75
The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan)	3.00
The Bishop and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan)	2.00
The Chorus Girl and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan)	2.00
A Short History of the American Labor Movement, Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe)	1.50
New Ventures of Faith, edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press)	.15
National Ideals in the Old Testament, Henry Cadbury (Scribners)	1.75
The Shadow, Mary White Ovington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe)	2.00
Man or the Machine, edited by Waldo R. Browne (H. W. Hulsebeck)	1.00
Untimely Papers, Randolph Bourne (H. W. Hulsebeck)	1.50
The Social Problem, Charles A. Millwood (Macmillan)	1.75
The New Social Order, Harry F. Ward (Macmillan)	2.50
Our America, Waldo Frank (Boal & Liveright)	2.00
The Grail of Life, John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.)	2.00
Fighting Without a War, Ralph Albertson (Harcourt, Brace & Howe)	1.50
Socialism in Thought and Action, Harry W. Laidler (Macmillan)	2.50
Liberty and the News, Walter Lippman (Harcourt, Brace & Howe)	1.00
The Brass Check, Upton Sinclair	.50
The Optimum Monopoly, Ellen N. La Motte (Macmillan)	1.00
Deba: His Authorised Life and Letters, David Karner (Boal & Liveright)	1.50
The Soul of the Russian Revolution, Molsen J. Olin (Henry Holt & Co.)	2.75
Russia in Upheaval, E. A. Ross (Century Co.)	2.50
The Red Heart of Russia, Benito Hurty (Century Co.)	2.00
Ten Days That Shook the World, John Reed (Boal & Liveright)	2.00
Lenin, Albert Rhys Williams (Scott & Selser)	1.50
Russia in 1919, Arthur Ransome (H. W. Hulsebeck)	1.50
Germany and Russia at Brest-Litovsk, Judah L. Margues (Rand School)	1.00
The Health Mission, William C. Hallitt (H. W. Hulsebeck)	1.00
Bolehavism, John Spargo (Harper)	1.75
The Russian Pendulum, Arthur Bulard (Macmillan)	2.00
The Plot Against Mexico, J. L. de Bekker (Alfred A. Knopf)	2.00
Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children (Scribner)	2.50

THE SOCIAL PREPARATION for THE KINGDOM OF GOD

A Religious-Socialist Quarterly

EASTER-TIDE NUMBER FEATURES

"Inside Soviet Russia 1919," by a clerical prisoner of the Soviets.
"Religious Socialism in Switzerland," by a clergyman of the State Church.
Annual Subscription \$1.00. Specimen Copies 25 cents.

Address The Social Preparation, Geneva, N. Y.

Beginning June 15th

The Annual Subscription Price of

The World Tomorrow

will be \$1.50

And the price of single issues 15 cts.

Share in the new party movement

READERS of *The World Tomorrow* are invited to attend the National Convention of The Committee of Forty-Eight to be held in Chicago on July 10, 12 and 13, to form a new political party.

To give the announcement of this convention the widest possible publicity it will be necessary to take paid advertising space in the newspapers. The majority of the press is either hostile to our movement or studiously indifferent in its editorial and news columns.

So we are asking you who believe in democracy to help put the message of The Committee of Forty-Eight before the American people. Text of the advertisement that will appear in a selected list of newspapers covering the 48 states, as quickly as funds are available for advertising cost, appears below. Read it now. If you want such a message to reach the majority of your fellow-citizens, fill out the blank in the corner and mail it to us today with a check that represents your conviction that the time is here for a political movement that will restore to us our constitutional rights.

TO AMERICANS READY FOR A NEW PARTY

YOU are invited to attend the National Convention of the Committee of Forty-Eight at Chicago, July 10th, 12th and 13th, to form a new political party.

It will be a national party representing the needs and hopes of average American men and women. It will conduct an aggressive campaign against both the reactionary old parties and in support of a constructive program of economic, social and political progress. Such a party must be put in the field in the coming election.

For we are witnessing a silent and ominous revolution in our national life. We have seen the tillers of our soil so discouraged by tenancy, speculation and the increasing exactions of a swarm of middlemen that hundreds of thousands of them are leaving the farms or curtailing production to a degree that menaces our nation's supply of food.

Prices are mounting while millions of pounds of food are held in storage or cast into the sea in order that still higher prices may be exacted.

We have seen our railroads wrecked by mismanagement and irresponsible financiers and then, after the government had stepped in to repair their injuries and decay, returned to the private management that had despoiled and ruined them, and on terms which arbitrarily guaranteed fixed dividends on watered stocks and bonds, making inevitable a still higher tax on consumption.

We are witnessing the effort to fix a legal status for labor, denying it the right to strike for higher wages, at the same time that profits are legally guaranteed to capital.

This is the underlying cause of the strikes that have increased until all industry is a battlefield of hatred and destruction, and the country is literally going to pieces with factional strife. This system has turned the "New Freedom" into an "Old Slavery" that has changed nothing but its color and its name.

Our money-lenders are seeking to drag us into

countless international imbróglios of concessions and investment, the effect of which will be to bind us by secret diplomacy to hazardous agreements entirely alien to our national traditions and desires. This system has so corrupted large sections of our press that the ability to read is fast becoming an impediment to the acquisition of truth. And to crown all, it has desecrated the flag by using it to cover a multitude of sins; and in the name of patriotism has attempted to fasten upon us a degrading economic and political slavery.

Autocracy is a thing abhorrent to us, to any man who has known even the memories of American freedom. We fought it overseas and helped to whip it. We will not yield to it here on our own soil and in our own homes.

Who will lead us in reorganizing and reasserting the American will to independence? It has become clearer with every sun that the old parties cannot do it; that they are but rival lackeys to great monopolies; that they are bankrupt of democratic purpose and have made their peace with a treasonable reaction. No matter which of these two parties wins, the people lose; no matter which of them captures office, it will be to do the bidding of the interests that filled its campaign coffers and paid for its publicity.

The time has come for lovers of the real America to organize themselves anew, to inaugurate another such period of resolute construction as four generations ago raised Jefferson and the once American Democratic party to power, and two generations since raised to power Lincoln and the once American Republican party. Once again constitutional liberties and representative government are threatened and the call goes out for a new political party to restore to America constitutional rights through which the government shall be made responsive to the will of the people.

The Committee of Forty-Eight

15 East 40th St.,

New York City, N. Y.

MAIL THIS TODAY

Name

Address

The
Committee
of 48
15 E. 40th St.
New York City
I am enclosing
\$.....to be used
for advertising the
National Convention.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 7

JULY, 1920

15 Cents

Is Labor Responsible for
the High Cost of Living?

The New Negro
Speaks

By Martha Gruening

William Blake
Comes Back

By Richard Roberts

On Nominating a President

By Albert De Silver

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the July Issue

	Page
Is Labor Responsible for the High Cost of Living?.....	196
William Blake Comes Back, by Richard Roberts.....	197
Signs of the Times.....	199
The New Negro Speaks, by Mariha Graessing.....	203
On Nominating a President, by Albert De Silver.....	205
Americanism Cross-Pollinated, by Orland O. Norris.....	207
Our Caribbean Empire.....	209
What of Japan? A View from Within. II.....	210
The Strike, A Symposium (concluded), by Hudson Maxim, Frank L. Morrison, A. J. Muste, J. P. Warshaw, J. T. Doran, Norman Thomas.....	213
Open for Discussion.....	218
Ex Libris.....	220

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III, July, 1920. No. 7

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
118 East 28th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevils Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gova Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Sandish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Melish, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrance, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.75. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

RICHARD ROBERTS is minister of the Pilgrim Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.
MARTHA GRUENING is active in literary and educational work, especially on behalf of the Negro.
ALBERT DE SILVER is director of the American Civil Liberties Union.
ORLAND O. NORRIS is editor of *The American Schoolmaster*, and an Associate Professor in Michigan State Normal College.
HUDSON MAXIM is well known as inventor, engineer, and author.
FRANK L. MORRISON is secretary of the American Federation of Labor.
A. J. MUSTE is national secretary of the Amalgamated Textile Workers.
J. P. WARSHAW is an eminent surgeon and president of the Cooperative League of America.
J. T. DORAN is a representative of the Northwest Defense Committee of the I. W. W.

THE TYPE IS SMALL BUT THE MESSAGE IMPORTANT

THE editors are deeply grateful to members of *The World Tomorrow* family for their gifts, pledges, and the letters that accompanied them. If other friends from whom we have not yet heard respond as generously in gifts, or, as some of our Cooperators suggest, in monthly pledges, our August issue will carry the news that the continuance of the magazine is assured. In the interest of economy we shall request our readers to consider receipt of the magazine as acknowledgment of their subscriptions. We shall appreciate their help in making known our new subscription price, \$1.50 a year. We are always glad to send sample copies.

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of *THE WORLD TOMORROW*, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of *THE WORLD TOMORROW*. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Prices of these books are subject to change by the publisher.

Useful Wild Plants, Charles Francis Saunders (McRide).....	\$3.00	Man or the State, Edited by Waldo R. Brown (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.25
Maureen, Patrick MacGill (McRide).....	2.00	The New Social Order, Harry F. Ward (Macmillan).....	2.50
Life of General William Booth, Harold Begbie (Macmillan).....	10.50	Our America, Waldo Frank (Boni & Liveright).....	2.00
Now It Can Be Told, Philip Gibbs (Harper).....	3.00	The Grail of Life, John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.).....	2.00
The Judgment of Peace, A. Latuke (Boni & Liveright).....	1.75	Fighting Without a War, Ralph Albertson (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan).....	3.00	Socialism in Thought and Action, Harry W. Laidler (Macmillan).....	2.50
The Bishop and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00	Liberty and the New, Walter Lippman (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
The Chorus Girl and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00	The Brass Check, Upton Sinclair.....	.60
A Short History of the American Labor Movement, Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50	The Optimism Monopoly, Ellen N. La Motte (Macmillan).....	1.50
New Ventures of Faith, edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press), Boards.....	.90	Debs: His Authorized Life and Letters, David Karsner (Boni & Liveright).....	1.50
National Ideals in the Old Testament, Henry Cadbury (Scrithers).....	1.75	The Bullitt Mission, William C. Bullitt (B. W. Huebsch), paper, 50c.; cloth.....	1.00
The Shadow, Mary White Orington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00	The Plot Against Mexico, J. L. de Bekker (Alfred A. Knopf).....	2.00
Untimely Papers, Randolph Bourne (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.50	Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children (Scrithers).....	2.50
The Social Problem, Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan).....	1.75		

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 7

JULY, 1920

15 Cents

Is Labor Responsible for the High Cost of Living

A CHANCE reader of our discussion on Strikes writes more in sorrow than in anger to rebuke us for publishing any defense of this iniquitous practice. "More and more," he declares, "all are seeing that the High Cost of Living is owing to strikes that stop production and transportation." Our critic explains that he is no capitalist, but a hard-working photographer. Obviously he merely repeats a lesson diligently inculcated by the newspapers. At any rate, he reckons without the chief statistical authority in the country on the subject. Dr. Royal S. Meeker, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, says, "Strikes and lockouts have contributed their thousands to the ranks of the out-of-workers; but irregularities and failure in supply of raw materials, transportation, and demand for commodities produced, and lack of proper organization in industry, have produced their millions." In other words, not labor but industrial mismanagement and economic maladjustment are primarily responsible for decreased production.

There is another charge brought against labor: that it is responsible for the high cost of living not merely because of its failure to produce, but because it has secured unreasonable wage advances. One can hardly buy a suit of clothes in a department store without being told, "Wages, you see, have gone up so much that we have to charge this price." It sounds convincing, especially to the salaried man whose salary seems the one stationary point in a world of change. But again let us turn to our authority. Dr. Meeker lists four causes for high prices, the most important of which is inflation of currency. The other three are "decrease in the actual quantity of the goods produced, manufacture for and purchase by the governments of the world for war and other purposes, and changes in the demand for supply of goods and services." Nowhere does he specifically mention exorbitant wage increases. He does indeed advocate increased production, but his main emphasis is on deflation of

currency and the "Establishment of a stable standard of value." Mr. Herbert Hoover, another authority who cannot be accused of undue partiality to labor, still less to radicalism, bears similar testimony. His eight causes for the high cost of living resemble Dr. Meeker's. He specifically adds profiteering, speculation, and war taxation; he urges "a constructive policy" to promote good relations between employer and employee so as to avoid the waste of strikes; but he nowhere refers to excessive wages.

So much for what may be called negative testimony. There are other angles from which we may approach the problem. If high wages are primarily responsible for the high cost of living, we might reasonably expect to find: (1) That the rate of increase in wages since 1914 would have equaled, if not exceeded, the rate of increase in the cost of living. Since the cost of living has increased by one hundred per cent., wages should show at least an equal increase. (2) That out of every dollar spent by the consumer labor would have received a larger proportion and capital a smaller proportion than before 1914. Certainly if labor is chiefly responsible for high prices either by reason of its failure to produce or its exorbitant demands, we should expect to find that capital would have made little or nothing by way of profits. Bearing these principles in mind, let us look at the facts as they have been brought out by that competent statistician W. Jett Lauck. His testimony before the United States Railroad Labor Board has now been summarized in a pamphlet entitled *Relation between Wages and the Increased Cost of Living; an Analysis of the Effects of Increased Wages and Profits upon Commodity Prices*. The sources of Mr. Lauck's figures are the famous Senate Document 259 compiled by the Treasury Department from income tax returns, and such reliable corporation publications as *Poor and Moody's Manual*. From these authoritative sources, Mr. Lauck finds that

with relatively few exceptions "wage increases have lagged behind price increases, and usually they are far behind." Not only have they lagged behind in amount, but in point of time increases in price were followed, not preceded, by increases in wages. This means in plain English that the average laborer receives less in "real wages" than before the war. If labor is more prosperous it is only because scarcity of supply owing to the war has on the whole reduced unemployment. Still more significant are Mr. Lauck's statistics showing that of each dollar spent by the consumer, labor has received a diminishing proportion, capital an increasing proportion. It is a trick of corporations to raise prices ten per cent. for every ten per cent. increase in wages. Since labor costs are never anywhere near the whole cost of production, this trick is enormously profitable. Mr. Lauck gives some startling figures on proportionate profits. For example, when he compiled his statistics, sugar was selling at twenty cents a pound, and the whole country was crying out in protest. Mr. Lauck shows that if the producer and retailer had been content with the same relative increase in profit as laborers in the sugar industry had received, sugar would be selling at eleven and a half cents a pound. Or take shoes: In 1914 when a man bought a pair of shoes, profits absorbed about one-half the price. This was almost three times the labor cost. In 1917 the profits were three-fifths the total cost and five times the total labor cost. In other words, "of the \$3.50 increase in the price of a pair of standard shoes labor received 15c while the profit margins of the various manufacturers and merchants absorb \$2.75." (The rest of the increase—60 cents—went for raw materials).

When one turns from these matters of proportion to figures of actual profiteering, unless he is an insurance actuary or an astronomer used to dealing in prodigious dimensions, his mind simply fails to grasp the size of the reward that this war for democracy brought to owners of property and privilege. Mr. Lauck concludes that "The combined corporations of the country earned in net profits approximately \$4,800,000,000 more per year during the three war years, 1916-1917-1918, than during the three pre-war years period; and this excess of profits over and above what the same corporations were satisfied with during the pre-war years constituted during 1916-'17-'18 a profiteering tax of \$240 per family of five throughout the nation." The number of millionaires in the United States trebled during the war. And men did not become millionaires simply by saving their wages in the shipyards instead of buying those silk shirts which so distress newspaper paragraphers when worn by wage earners! "One-eighth of the total taxable income from all of the toil and ingenuity going into all of the productive processes of the country at the present time goes to six one-thousandths of one per cent. of the whole people. Their number is 6,664. Their com-

bined income in 1917 was \$1,709,365,988. Seventy per cent. of this, or over \$1,250,000,000, came from property. Their proportion of the total income has, on the face of later, but as yet unofficial, figures, greatly increased." Profits in such basic materials as copper and coal were staggering. In copper, for instance, capital received about two and one-half times as much per pound as labor, and of the price paid by the purchaser fifty-four per cent. went to the payment of profits and royalties. Enormous as are the dividends reported by Mr. Lauck, it is reasonable to believe that they do not tell the whole story, for in many cases real profits were covered up by all sorts of bookkeeping devices, such as swollen amortization funds, and by excessive salaries. The American Metal Company, for instance, paid about \$1,000,000 a year in salaries to six officers. A great flood of stock dividends since the Supreme Court has declared them not subject to the income tax gives further proof of the concealed profits which in most cases were not due to increased production but to the increased share of the sales price taken by the corporations. The worst of it is that to a great extent these profits are now part of capital so that consumers will have to go on paying dividends not on capital painfully saved by the honest toiler who is the hero of the orthodox economist, but on the earning capacity of great corporations. To quote Mr. Lauck, "The menace of the future lies in the probability that the vast profits which are still held in reserve will be capitalized in order that, under the pretext of a fair return on capital, those who own them may continue to take the larger proportion of national income, even at the expense of very great suffering on the part of the workers."

These are the facts. Some papers have published them, but in general the press continues to blame labor for our present plight. They do it as part of the organized campaign of powerful sections of the employing groups. Mr. Roger Babson, in a letter urging his capitalist clientele to use their victory over the workers generously, makes this candid statement: "We said that the employing class was immensely more powerful than in 1914. There is more money at its command. Eighteen thousand new millionaires are the war's legacy. This money capacity is more thoroughly unified than ever. In 1914 we had 30,000 banks, functioning to a great degree in independence of each other. Then came the Federal Reserve Act and gave us the machinery for consolidation and the emergency of five years' war furnished the hammer blows to weld the structure into one. The war taught the employing class the secret and the power of widespread propaganda. Imperial Europe had been aware of this power. It was new to the United States. Now, when we have anything to sell to the American people, we know how to sell it. We have learned. We have the schools. We have the pulpits. The employing class owns the press. There is practically no important paper in the United States but is theirs!" These

papers owned by the employing class, by a clever play upon fear of the "reds" and by misrepresenting facts, are swinging public sentiment to support capital against labor. The great steel strike illustrated that fact. As a captain of industry exultingly put it the other day, "Heretofore men have been sorry for the workers in dull times, but now they'll get nothing but the cold hatred they have earned."

We do not call attention to the extent of profiteering or to the frame of mind of some—of course, not all—employers in order to cast doubt on the need of increased production on the farm or in the factory but rather to point out that the capitalist system in this mood can never secure it. Production is falling off, strife and confusion are increasing. The situation is past cure by pious preachments either to farmers or laborers on the necessity of production. Despite capital's present victory, the time has already come when men will not be persuaded to give their best efforts to production in order that the few may profit. The tenant farmer, for example, will not become a scientific agriculturist in order to support the landowner in idleness. The farmer who works his own land has the heart taken out of him by the profiteering of the innumerable middlemen who control the channels of distribution. Labor feels no zest for strenuous production when it becomes aware of the way in which the fruits of its toil are divided. Whatever the immediate remedies

ought to be for the high cost of living, study of the underlying facts leads to one conclusion: namely, that production for use must take the place of production for profit; that land, natural resources, and machinery must be socially controlled for the good of all. To find the way to an economic order which will at once accomplish these ends and emancipate the spirit of men is the great task of our time. Our present system of wild profiteering has resulted not merely in wage slavery, class hatred, and devastating war, but in actual starvation in a world of potential plenty.

It was no radical but the British Ambassador, Sir Auckland Geddes, who recently declared with regard to Europe: "The great accumulations of wealth are, I think, more or less obviously nearing the end of their making. . . . The period of the great raids, if one may use that phrase, upon the resources of nature is drawing to its close all the world over. . . . We have got in Europe now millions of people who are at this stage—millions of working people who say to themselves: 'What is a life worth that at the end leaves us with nothing achieved except having avoided being starved to death and having produced children who will follow in our path?' That is the great problem that is worrying the minds of millions in Europe."

What is worrying Europe today will worry America tomorrow. Will we be wise in time?

William Blake Comes Back

By RICHARD ROBERTS

IF one could make a little journey into the *hinterland* of things and talk with Blake as he talked with Voltaire, and Isaiah and other notable personages, his conversation would doubtless be full of meat. Most of it would probably fail to pass the editorial censor of the *New York Times*,—it would hardly be "fit to print." His reflections on Sir Oliver Lodge, for instance, might easily incline to undue though characteristic violence: and even at this late date his animadversions on the Great War and the Great Peace might get his reporter into the penitentiary. He would most certainly affirm that he had antedated Einstein by more than a century; and it is not unlikely that we should find him sporting a red cap in honor of Lenin. His opinion of Speaker Sweet would be particularly edifying,—not that he would be specially in love with the socialist economics; but he did love a thing called liberty.

Perhaps we may yet hear from Blake. He seems to be coming back; and reviving interest in him is one of the reassuring signs of the times. The Grolier Club showed a fine collection of his prints, books, and color-work a few weeks ago. A good many things have been written of him during the last two or three years and more is reported to be

on the way. Our grandfathers put him down a madman; our rediscovery of him looks like a return to sanity.

Blake was a good hater; but most of all he hated hatred. In some things he was a bigot, but he was chiefly bigoted against bigotry. At times he was apt to be intolerant of people, but he was always intolerant of intolerance. Even if—as the way of men is—his precept went ahead of his practice, he nevertheless saw the meaning of freedom more plainly than Byron or Shelley or others of his rebel contemporaries did. Indeed, of all the men of that time only one perceived the logic of liberty with the same clear assurance as Blake. That was Lamennais.

But while Lamennais was concerned with freedom in Church and State, Blake fought lustily for it elsewhere—against traditionalism in Art and legalism in Morality, against formalism in Religion and dogmatism in Thought. Wherever he saw the human spirit cramped, Blake laid about him with a will. But he did not think, as Shelley seemed to do, that freedom was the absence of restriction. It was rather a positive condition in which a man could be true to himself through everything and be the whole man it was in him to be; and if you

only gave human nature a chance, Blake believed it could provide its own safeguard against a riotous use of freedom. This was indeed implicit in Blake's psychological scheme. Life discharged itself in energy; but this energy had desire for its driving force and reason for its discipline. Energy becomes fruitful when desire and reason each does its own work. Let one or other cease to do or over-do its task; and energy goes awry. When desire gets into the saddle, then comes the "vegetated life," the life of sensuality. Let reason gain the whip-hand; and it imprisons energy within closed systems and kills individuality. But observe that the operations of reason were not designed to suppress desire,—Blake had a fine contempt for those whose "desires were weak enough to be suppressed,"—they were meant rather to pilot it; to provide it with channels. But the trouble was that reason mistook its office and set out drawing lines of orthodoxy which it called upon every man to toe. Reason (that is) which was meant to be a discipline became a despot; and it was against this perverted despotism of reason that Blake launched his hottest fire-bolts. The mania for schematization which Protestantism inherited from the schoolmen had spread its blight over the whole of life; and William Blake was commissioned to break its unholy spell.

In ethics Blake was a consistent dualist. He saw good and evil in ceaseless warfare, and he dramatized the struggle in a large and weird symbolism. But his criterion in ethics was unusual. That which created, fostered, stimulated fellowship was good; that which denied or destroyed fellowship was evil. He was not bothered by the Judaic-Protestant ethic with its concern for the equilibration of individual rights which are always potentially in conflict, and its apparatus of pains and penalties. He was not a good forgiver himself, but he saw quite clearly that forgiveness is the first condition of a living social integration; and his emphasis is all the time on the "society-making" virtues. Let anyone read the description of Golgonooza in "Jerusalem" and he will see this plainly. But dualist though Blake may have been in giving a positive character to good and evil alike, he had none of the stupid dualism which sends modern popular ethics so badly astray,—that dualism which separates "individual" and "social" ethics and puts justice and love in antithesis. To Blake love was the only justice.

But Blake's great distinction lay in his utter contempt of the dualism of spirit and matter. The popular Mid-Victorian preacher, Thomas Binney, wrote a book called *How to Make the Best of Both Worlds*; two worlds in succession, of course. And the answer was, honest business for this world and religion for the next. But Blake did not see it in that way. He set out to live in the two worlds at the same time. Not that he thought of them as two worlds. The body, he said, is that part of the soul

that you can see; and the world, he might have said, is that part of the universe that you can see. He would, however, have been careful to add that it was that part of the world which he saw *with* his eyes. He saw a great deal more *through* them, as he said on one occasion. With his eyes he saw the rising sun as a mere disc of fire; but *through* his eyes he saw "a great multitude of the heavenly host crying Holy, Holy, Holy." The frontiers of sense were no frontiers to Blake. He crossed them to and fro as though they were not there; and it is very difficult for those who lack the amphibious mind to follow him in his swift transits from the village suburbs of London to the shadowy purlieus of Golgonooza. But fantastic as it seems to us that Blake should take his "visions" seriously, it is a dull dogmatism that dismisses it as folly. For our folly is indeed greater. We have set the seen and the unseen in opposition; the devout have chosen the unseen, the worldly the seen. Blake made the right choice, which is the choice of both. One of these days we may discover that the real business of religion is to enable us to live in two worlds at once—and to find them to be in experience the one universe they are in fact.

"A musician, a painter, a sculptor, a poet,—a man or woman who is not one of these is not a Christian." This is not orthodox doctrine; but when the Church has been purged of what Mr. Bernard Shaw calls "Salvationism," Blake's theology may yet become respectable. For what he meant was simply that the Christ-spirit will express itself in works of love and beauty. Now Blake was orthodox enough in his own way. He had a doctrine of conversion thoroughgoing enough to satisfy a revivalist. "Man," he said, "is born a Satan and needs a new selfhood continually." That is good New Testament teaching; but in Blake's view of it conversion was a process which produced artists. The true life is the creative life,—whatever the medium: sound or color, stone or word. It turns upon matter with a vision of beauty and makes it a vehicle for that beauty; and it does much more. It turns upon men with love and by love redeems them. It creates not only the thing of beauty; it creates the sovereign beauty—the beauty of a free living society. And it is not to be forgotten that it was as the builder of such a society that Blake chiefly regarded himself.

But first and last, Blake was a great humanist. Look at his drawings and you will see that wherever there is a space to be filled up, he draws a human figure—"the human form divine." Indeed, he hardly ever draws anything else—except occasional serpents which symbolized the Anti-human. In his Job drawings, God and Job are palpably the same person—a point full of meaning. And the stark, bold definition of his drawing shows that however vague and elusive his metaphysics might have been there was no doubt about his sense of the sovereignty of personality. "Labor well the Minute

Particulars," he cries, "care for the little ones,"—by which he meant common men and women. And his loud, deep cursing of the 'systems' sprang from his feeling that they bound and crushed the single soul. His *America* (so little known in America, alas!) was a great outburst of sheer joy in the disruption of a dehumanizing imperialism; and if his *French Revolution* had been finished, it would have been a loud chant of triumphant Freedom. In his *Europe* he foreshadows the downfall of the monarchism which held common folk in a debasing bondage; but he prophesied too soon. For that political animal man has set up other idols; and for the divine right of kings he has substituted the divine right of States. And now the ascendancy of the State over men has to be broken; and new so-

cial forms have to be devised which will not deprive any man of his due inheritance of freedom. That is the task before us; and Blake will help us to recover that fundamental conviction (without which all our labor will be vain) that institutions are made for man, and not man for institutions, whether they be Church or State, Commerce or Leagues of Nations.

It is seemingly an incorrigible bias in human nature to subordinate life to forms and formulae: we are forever forging chains for ourselves. Blake comes back to call upon us to enthroned Life and to create that one human family, holy and indivisible, conceived in freedom, subsisting in fellowship, in which Life will come into its Kingdom.

Signs of the Times

The Old Guard Picks Its Man

THE Republican platform might have been a bit more reactionary; the nominee might have been Wood or Lowden instead of that personally estimable, very likable, and generally colorless one-hundred-per-cent, party Republican, Warren G. Harding. For the rest, the Old Guard and the big business men behind them have every reason to be satisfied. If with such a platform and such candidates they can win the election they can get what they want; that is, for a little while longer. Sufficient unto the day are the profits thereof. An equally reactionary but braver convention might have taken a chance on Wood or Lowden, despite Johnson, Borah, and the campaign fund disclosures; a wiser convention equally devoted to the conservative viewpoint would have nominated Hoover—the one man who might have made our creaking economic and political machinery run a bit longer and more smoothly. But an Old Guard Convention to whom La Follette was anathema and Johnson suspect ran true to form. It took a man not wholly reactionary or militaristic but essentially pliable to its will. If Senator Harding better than a stronger man helps us to see that our primary need is less for a new leader than for a new social order with new motives and ideals to inspire it, he will not have been nominated in vain.

Good and Bad in the Labor Convention

THE A. F. of L. convention at Montreal was as strictly "old guard" in make-up and ideals from the labor standpoint as the Chicago Convention from the political. The Convention did some good things. Threatened by the alternative of sec-

ing Negroes used to scab on white labor or admitting them on a footing of equality into the unions, it emphatically endorsed the latter position. It favored amnesty for political prisoners. It declared for Irish independence. Rather inconsistently, it then also endorsed the League of Nations, though only after a bitter fight. But it refused to urge recognition of Soviet Russia, on the ground that the Russian government is undemocratic and that it has conscripted labor and abridged freedom of speech. The Convention's fear of conscription is sound, but for it therefore to line up with all the imperialists in the world in the iniquitous fight against a government obviously overwhelmingly supported by the people is a gigantic error, from the standpoint both of ordinary humanity and of the real interests of labor. There is something ludicrous about a labor leadership which bitterly denounces the Administration for its domestic policy and then docilely accepts its word on Russian affairs in opposition to that not only of disinterested investigators but of the British Labor Delegates who recently visited Russia. The determination of the Convention to bear the expense of sending twenty-odd organizers into Western Canada to fight—not exploitation and oppression—but the rival organization, the O. B. U., was characteristic of its present leadership, which is more interested in its own organization than in its cause. As a whole, the Convention acted like a defensive body, clinging to outworn and inadequate formulas and tactics. The one exception which may prove to be of extraordinary significance was the clean-cut victory of the Plumb Plan for the railroads (they didn't call it that) over the opposition of Samuel Gompers himself.

The Interchurch World Movement

PERHAPS it is just as well that the Interchurch Movement didn't half raise its \$300,000,000. The seal of apparent success might have sanctified some very unlovely promoter's methods for "putting across" the church to the public. The friends of the Movement have taken the lead in wholesome economies and reforms. We hope they will succeed in saving a Movement that once had some real promise of usefulness. But to save it as a Christian enterprise means an absolute end of such advertising as that which, under the sign of the cross and in the name of Faith, quoted from Mr. Roger Babson's perfectly honest appeal for the support of the church as the best protection for dividends. In the days of its strength the church spoke with a commanding voice not as a sublimated guardian of the treasures of the rich, but as the custodian of the glad tidings of righteousness, brotherhood, and peace. The first fruits of a real reform in the Interchurch Movement will be its fearlessness in publishing and circulating its long delayed report on the steel strike. It is known that its Commission is frankly critical of the attitude of the Steel Corporation. Let the Movement publish the fact broadcast, and the workers may come to believe that Mr. Babson's recent statement, "we [the employers] have the pulpits," is in need of some qualification or explanation.

One Wrong Partially Righted

SOME Americans find it a bit easier to keep their national self-respect now that Kate Richards O'Hare is out of jail. The thought of this brave spirit, this mother of four children, in jail as a result of an obvious frame-up was well-nigh intolerable. Yet she made that prison a place of inspiration. Her letters brought new evidence of the capacity of all sorts of folks, even those the world calls criminal, for generosity and friendship. Mrs. O'Hare will continue her work on the outside, not merely for the cause of the working class but for the prisoners whom she came to know and to love in the Jefferson City Penitentiary. In particular, she does not want her friends to forget that Mollie Steimer is in the prison she left, sent there for no other fault than for her protest against the crime of our intervention in Russia. It was characteristic of our present Department of Justice that, when at last public pressure forced it to secure from the President a commutation of Mrs. O'Hare's sentence, its belated act of partial justice was accompanied by no restoration of her civil rights.

Does President Wilson Know These Facts?

THE lot of political prisoners in the United States—like the lot of all prisoners—is often bitter. We are reliably informed that an I. W. W. political prisoner named McCoshen in the Fort Leavenworth federal penitentiary was manacled in a standing position nine hours a day to the bars of

his solitary cell from November 12th until a week or so ago when he was released on bail, pending appeal. He had refused to obey an order of a deputy warden which he felt was unjust. This cruel punishment was brought to the attention of the Department of Justice. The Department replied that while it had not particular knowledge of McCoshen's case, "The Department is entirely satisfied with this form of punishment [manacling in solitary cells] and contemplates no change." The War Department also bears its share of guilt in the matter of political prisoners. Brent Dow Allison, conscientious objector, for some reason or other has been kept in the federal penitentiary at Fort Leavenworth instead of with the other objectors in the internment camp at Fort Douglas. The newspaper notoriety given this case resulted in contemptible persecution for him at the hands of prison officials. Every obsolete prison rule is enforced against him, and he has been a victim of all that petty tyranny which is characteristic of prison administration. Yet his spirit is unbroken. These matters have repeatedly and vainly been called to the attention of the War Department. The same Department recently gave certain individuals interested in amnesty to understand that if only the men at Fort Douglas would go to work under military orders (they now do the necessary work in their cantonment on a cooperative arrangement) they would shortly be released. On this assurance some men did decide to obey military orders—and have not been released. When this matter was called to the attention of Colonel Reddington of the Prison Department he stated that the "policy of the War Department in this matter was negative. Pardon for conscientious objectors would not be considered if they did not work but would not necessarily be considered if they did work." In Fort Douglas, Howard Moore is still confined. His case will be recalled by readers of THE WORLD TOMORROW. His valiant and unselfish service as a volunteer in nursing patients during the epidemic of influenza at Fort Riley won him the good-will of army officers at the base hospital, who spoke of that service in the highest terms. Secretary Baker, however, has recently refused to consider it as a ground for pardoning Moore. He explained that this was voluntary service and that Moore is entitled to no further hearing until he will obey military orders. Truly an edifying spectacle, this, of a great government trying to break the conscience of some of the finest of its young citizens!

Mr. Palmer's Tragedy of Errors

WE urge readers of THE WORLD TOMORROW who desire to know to what extent the United States has adopted the policy of Czaristic Russia to write either to the National Popular Government League, Washington, D. C., or to the American Civil Liberties Union, 138 West 13th

Street, New York, for a copy of the "Report upon the Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice." It is signed by twelve lawyers of the highest standing in the United States including among others Dean Pound of the Harvard Law School, Francis Fusher Kane, ex-Federal attorney of Philadelphia, and Frank P. Walsh. The report has been justly characterized as a record of "brutality, torture, forgery, theft, and the provoking of crime in order to detect it."

Civil Liberties: the Dark Side and the Bright

MR. ROGER N. BALDWIN, Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, has recently returned from a trip covering practically every state in the Union outside of New England. Almost everywhere he finds the "lid riveted down." Widely though the conditions vary, there is the same underlying struggle on the part of business and property interests "to keep labor in its place." To that end the war hysteria was a great boon. It made it easier to do away with civil rights for the workers. In one day's meeting the Executive Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union received reports illustrating denial of civil rights and the growth of bitterness in the industrial struggle from every section of the country. In Bisbee, Arizona, they have at last brought to trial the men who in the early days of the war, without any warrant of law, deported into the desert striking miners guilty of no overt act against public peace. The facts are admitted, but the defense is that the deportations were for the sake of "law and order" in Bisbee, and on that basis already one of the defendants who was tried separately has been acquitted by a jury five of whose members were illiterate. The copper companies are leaving no stone unturned to secure an acquittal of the other defendants in the principal trial. The situation in West Virginia coal mines is likely at any moment to break out into open civil war. Logan County and to a less degree Mingo County, where the massacre of Matewan took place, are private preserves of the coal companies who allow no possible labor organizer or agitator to enter their territory. A Labor man from Pascagula, Mississippi, writes that the situation there would bear investigation from an outside agency, but with grim humor adds, "The investigator ought to have a paid-up life insurance policy." Butte, Montana, is an armed camp. None of the copper mine guards, led according to report by John F. Ryan's private secretary, has been brought to punishment for firing upon and killing unarmed strike pickets.

The acquittal of Krieger in Oklahoma and of the Communists in Rockford, Illinois, gives proof that justice is not altogether dead; but the fundamentally encouraging feature of the situation as seen by Mr. Baldwin and as evidenced in reports to the Civil Liberties Union is the growing strength of farmer and labor organizations working in close

alliance. In connection with them also the Co-operative Movement is spreading rapidly. Constructively-minded radicals denied opportunity for general agitation are more and more working within these farmer and labor groups, and through them progress will come. The fight for civil liberties will not be finally won save in conjunction with an economic emancipation.

Will We Learn from Sarajevo?

IN the summer of 1914 the great Austro-Hungarian Empire presented an arrogant ultimatum to the little kingdom of Serbia. It precipitated the World War. The United States fought for the rights of small nations. Six years later the Fall Committee of the United States Senate appointed to investigate Mexican conditions seriously proposes a far more arrogant ultimatum to the little republic of Mexico. It demands nothing less than the revision of the Mexican Constitution in the interests of American investors. Senator Lodge in his key-note speech at Chicago talked piously about a mandate for Mexico rather than Armenia. It is of course an unimportant detail that Mexico, unlike Armenia, wants no such mandate and will fight it grimly. The Republican platform did not go as far as Senator Lodge, but it points in the same direction. The plans of the interventionists are becoming clear. Unless they can make the Obregon government their vassal they will work for the sending of an American Army to protect American lives and to rescue the Mexican people from chaos! The new Mexican government starts under a shadow. More and more evidence is piling up to show that whatever mistakes Carranza made he fell not so much because of them as by reason of his virtues, his antagonism to foreign exploitation and domestic militarism. The future is dark. But it is not hopeless. There ought to be enough plain horse sense in the United States to keep Americans from sacrificing their lives and burdening themselves with more debts for the protection of the great corporations who now are making enormous profits in oil and minerals. The internal problem of Mexico can be solved by four things: peace; government in the interest of the people, not the big interests; an end to the exploitation of the peon; and a vigorous and well-balanced program of education. The United States can lend a hand in attaining this program without any military intervention.

British Whitewash

NO more shameful attempt was ever made to whitewash hideous atrocities than the report of the Majority of the Hunter Commission appointed to investigate the Punjab disturbances whose most tragic event was the massacre of Amritsar. The report is its own condemnation; but fortunately we can check it not only by the

Minority Report but by the thorough report of a committee of the Indian National Council, including among its members that modern saint Ghandi. The reports have been excellently summarized in the International Supplement to *The Nation* for June 19th. The significance of the records is less in the stories of atrocity they present than in the revelations of the imperial and military mind. The British authorities and the Hunter Commission who investigated them were all under the same evil spell: they did not think primarily of men and women and children—at least not if they were Indian; they did not concern themselves first with mercy and justice, but with "order" and Empire. General Dyer's zeal may at some points have been excessive or unwise, the Commission seems to say, but after all he stood for the Empire. If the Empire can rest only on martial law, airplane bombs, and policemen's whips, so be it. This poison of imperialism spares no race and is peculiar to no generation. Neither Britain nor America is immune to it. Even Christian missionaries have not protested the atrocities in the Punjab as they would if the offenders had been Germans or Japanese. The moral is plain. Atrocities will occur while autocracy endures. He who is the foe of imperialism must admit no exceptions. The hope of the world lies in labor's learning the lesson. In particular, the eyes of mankind are upon British labor. It is growing in power at home; but its victories there will be almost meaningless for the world if it remains imperialistic. The first duty of British labor is to listen to the counsels of its own best leaders and prove it loves liberty more than empire in India and Ireland.

Meddlers or Peace-Makers?

IN the recent county elections in Ireland out of 699 seats, Sinn Fein alone won 525 and the combined forces of Sinn Fein, the Labor Party, and the Nationalists won 590. This overwhelming proof of the people's will and their desire to use the ballot rather than the bullet to win their freedom ought to give food for thought to those erstwhile believers in self-determination who are now stalwart supporters of the British Empire. Some American opposition to Irish independence is a hold-over from the war psychology; some if it is inspired by British propaganda, some of it by the religious prejudice to which the Ulster delegation so frankly appealed, or by an honest bewilderment over the Ulster problem; some of it arises from a not wholly unwarranted mistrust of the character and purpose of certain Irish-American politicians who head the movement here. But deeper than these things is a belief that meddling in British affairs endangers peace. With this desire for peace every decent American must be in accord; but it is war, not peace, which will be promoted by liberals who refuse to listen to Ireland's

case for freedom. The peace of an Anglo-American Tory alliance resting on a common consent to ignore the wrongs of Negroes, Mexicans, Irish, Hindus, Egyptians, is of all things least noble and least secure. True lovers of peace will want to attain justice for the Irish and all other oppressed groups now so that the rival financial interests and big-navy promoters cannot use Ireland—or any other country—as a moral pretext for a future imperialistic war.

The real cause of a war with Britain will not be Ireland but oil or some other great interest, and that war is all too likely if capitalistic imperialism continues. On both sides of the water the jingoes are tied up with finance. *The Bystander*, a supposedly humorous British publication, publishes an anti-American number prompted wholly by the unfavorable rate of exchange. *John Bull*, Britain's yellowest weekly and most widely circulated, is more anti-American than our Hearst papers are anti-English. A certain Grant Morden, a correspondent tells us, is a big stock-holder in *John Bull*. The same gentleman was one of the prime movers in organizing the new Canadian rival to our Steel Trust. He who runs may read.

Planning the Scientific Destruction of Humanity

FIELD MARSHAL WILSON, British Chief of Staff, has been telling a soldier audience how illusory is the hope of peace. Let Britain prepare, he urged, for the future of the Empire is anxious. How Britain is to prepare, and with her, of course, all other powers if the militarists have their way, the *London Nation* has revealed to laymen by its examination of articles in the *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*. British officers, it appears, calmly expect enormous developments of tank warfare and gas warfare. But worse is to come. Major-General Swinton writes: "We have X-rays, we have light rays, we have heat rays. Mr. H. G. Wells, in his *War of the Worlds*, alludes to the heat rays of the Martians, and we may not be so very far from the development of some kind of lethal ray which will shrivel up or paralyze or poison human beings if they are unprotected. . . . The final form of human warfare, as I regard it, is germ-warfare. I think it will come to that, and so far as I see there is no reason why it should not, if we mean to fight." British naval officers also justify submarine attacks on merchant vessels.

We owe these officers a debt for both their logic and their honesty. They know what war is and must be. Is it possible that humanity is so devoid not only of good-will but of ordinary intelligence that it will let its quarrels bring it to such a horrible end of civilization, perhaps of life itself, upon this planet? Can anyone be an optimist regarding the future of humanity unless he is a pacifist firmly determined to secure the end of war by the establishment of a new fraternity among men?

The New Negro Speaks

By MARTHA GRUENING

SIX HUNDRED delegates to the Convention of The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People met last week in Atlanta, Georgia, in the heart of the Southern South. They met there at the invitation, among others, of Governor Hugh M. Dorsey, of Georgia, Mayor L. Key, of Atlanta, The Atlanta Committee on Church Cooperation, and the Christian Council. For three days they enjoyed free and frank discussion of Negro problems and adjourned after having unanimously passed resolutions demanding for themselves the vote, federal suppression of lynching, federal aid to education for black and white children alike, and federal legislation against Jim-Crowism in interstate commerce and against racial segregation in the Civil Service. All of this took place in a city intensely southern in its feeling without causing any disturbance or even extended comment.

For the Negro to speak concerning his problems is not new. He has always spoken about them to some extent, though what he said may not have been greatly heeded, but it is distinctly new for the South to listen to the Negro instead of claiming the right to tell the world about him. There is undoubtedly a new Negro and also to some extent a new South, and for the first time in a long period of years the two have met on a plane of equality and very nearly mutual good manners and conferred on the subject close to their hearts, on the initiative of both groups.

What is the reason for this change? Undoubtedly, such a meeting would have been the cause of race riots in the not far distant past; and such a result was indeed freely predicted in certain quarters for the present conference, the prophets believing that it could fail to be dangerous only by being totally unimportant; but neither of these predictions was verified. Three elements enter into the great change in the condition of the Negro: the unprecedented industrial opportunities for Negroes in the North, the new spirit of the Negro soldier who has come back prepared to fight for Democracy at home as well as abroad, and the gradual and growing effect of the constant vigilance and agitation of the National Association and other more radical bodies to secure and safeguard the rights of colored people. The chief of these factors in changing the face if not the heart of the South is undoubtedly the economic one, and of this the new Negro is fully aware. He is alive to the significance of Governor Dorsey's remarks: "The economic value of the Negro has not been fully appreciated. It will be better understood when ploughs are idle and farms run to wood." The new Negro sees his labor power as an asset not only to the white South but to himself. He is increasingly self-conscious and has discovered the

meaning of solidarity along race and to some extent along class lines. It is not strange that he should incidentally bring a new South into being.

THE OLD SOUTH PASSES

The old South was, to be sure, occasionally in evidence at the Conference and nothing was more interesting than its instant and firm though courteous rejection of it. There was a trace of it in Mayor Key's address of welcome, asking the delegates to accept the prevailing social standards of Atlanta for the good of the Convention. It cropped up again in a story told by Eugene R. Black, President of the Chamber of Commerce. It was one of those old standby's we all know so well of the speaker's childhood playfellow, in this case "Jack, whose face was black as the Ace of Spades, but whose heart was white as a lily." Jack returning South to die after an unfortunate sojourn in the North rang the Speaker's door-bell on a wintry night and was taken in by his old friend and given "a room in the basement" and later, as a climax, a silver coffin-plate bearing the simple legend "My Brother." The narrator's voice trembled as he reached this climax, but the colored audience sat unmoved although a slight and scarcely definable ripple had gone through them at the mention of the "basement room." But when the Rev. Robert W. Bagnall, a colored Episcopal Clergyman of Detroit, and the last speaker of the evening, turned suddenly to Black and said: "Your story does indeed mark an advance of Christianity in the South. If you could not take 'Your Brother' into your guest-room as the Bishop did Jean Valjean, you did minister to him in the basement and in so far followed in your Master's steps," the applause was thunderous. For hours the Negro audience had listened with patient civility to the platitudes of white Christians and particularly to the clerical member of the Interracial Council, an institution which advocates dealing with the color problem in the "spirit of Jesus Christ" and countenances segregation; but it was not until Bagnall came that they got what they wanted and showed it in no uncertain terms. The previous speaker had dwelt at length on the achievements of the Council in promoting good feeling between the races, and obtaining justice for the black one. "It is not the first time we have had inter-racial councils and commissions," Bagnall said in reply to this, "and it is not the first time that Negroes in great numbers have left the South. In 1879-'80, one hundred thousand Negroes migrated North, chiefly from Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The causes for their migration were the same as those of the present one: lynching, then at

the hands of the Ku-Klux clan, today at the hands of Southern mobs, whose burnings and torturings exceed anything the Ku-Klux ever perpetrated; disfranchisement, robbery by force and fraud of the ballot, reinforced today by the majority of the law in grandfather clauses and the administration of election laws; injustice in the courts, still rampant today as the Arkansas cases show; low wages and the tenant system, which was nothing but peonage. All these conditions exist in the South today in addition to Jim-Crowing and a more intense segregation. And the reactions of the South of that day," he went on, "were identical with those of the South of today. At first they treated the migrations as a joke, and the Press of that day carried humorous stories about the vicissitudes of the Negroes in the North; but when their man-power was diminished they became alarmed, and when their crops began to be ruined and their wealth to fail because of migration, they grew desperate. They called inter-racial meetings; they bribed and coerced and cajoled Negro leaders to speak against the migration; they refused to sell Negroes transportation; they arrested migrants on false charges and beat them up; they called a great Inter-racial Convention in Vicksburg, where they enunciated that Negroes were citizens equally as the whites and should be granted equal industrial opportunities with them, the same use of the ballot, and full protection for life, liberty and property. But this pronouncement did not stop migration because the Negroes did not believe it. They may give us inter-racial councils today as much as they please. It may help, but it will not stop migration. Until Negroes know that the causes of migration have been removed, they will continue to migrate."

So the Negro spoke and the South listened. It heard other surprising things as when James Weldon Johnson in a speech highly charged with statistics showed that the "usual crime" was not the usual cause of lynching, and no more the usual crime of Negroes than of any other race. It heard the varied and dramatic stories of delegates from more than three hundred branches in forty-three states of the Union; sometimes cheering stories of friendly cooperation between the races in fighting discrimination in local conditions, others of grim up-hill struggle for the right even to organize and maintain a branch in the face of an opposition which did not scruple to use every weapon of legal and extra-legal terrorism. There were instances of long-established wrongs slowly giving way under the power of new race consciousness and organization.

There was a report of the Chicago delegation on legal work which had resulted in freeing all but two of the Negro prisoners out of the sixty-seven held in connection with the Chicago riots and the conviction of ten white men so held, a new record in inter-racial justice whether North or South. Lastly,

there was the unforgettable delegate from Boley, Oklahoma, who apologized for the dilatoriness of his home town in forming a branch, on the ground that Boley having but one race, the Negro, within its borders, had until lately been blissfully unaware of race friction. "If any of you," he said, addressing the white people present, "if President Wilson comes to Boley and misbehaves himself, he will be arrested by a Negro policeman, lodged in a Negro jail, tried by a Negro judge and prosecuted by a Negro District Attorney."

'WHAT THE ATLANTA CONVENTION LACKED

But stirring and stimulating as such utterances might prove to a sympathetic listener, after three days of them one inevitably became conscious of a certain lack in the program of the Convention. That there was a new Negro was evident, but where was he going? What was he thinking? He had discovered himself and was asserting the discovery with a loudness not unnatural under the circumstances, but what did he propose beyond this? This lack seems to the writer to inhere in the fact that the National Association has not and deliberately avoids having an economic or political program. It based its appeal originally on the conscience of the American people with a greater emphasis in recent years on the awakening consciousness and self-respect of the Negro himself. It strove to render the Negro articulate, but stopped at giving him anything to be articulate about. In this it seems to bear the same relation to the entire forward movement of the Negro race as the Suffrage movement does to Feminism. Its arguments to some extent lacked realism, for the same reason that Suffrage arguments frequently do, and became at times merely oratorical. "Go North" was a slogan which could be counted on to rouse the enthusiasm of the delegates, yet the events of the past few years show that the North is not entirely a promised land and that migration alone merely shifts the burden of race hostility from one section to another. In only one speech, that of Bagnall, already quoted, did industrial conditions among Negroes receive any extended attention. Competition with white labor, industrial organization or the lack of it, inadequate housing in such rapidly growing industrial centers as Detroit, Buffalo, and Cleveland, which in conjunction with the never-ending anti-Negro propaganda flowing ceaselessly out of the South gave us the bloody Chicago and East St. Louis riots, were practically ignored by the Atlanta Convention. They were, however, being seriously considered at almost the same time by another Negro group, the newly formed "Friends of Negro Freedom," which met and organized the same week in Washington, D. C. This organization is undoubtedly an expression of the "left wing" among Negro radicals, and its emphasis is not on racial but on economic aspects of the Negro problem. It even repudiates the sug-

gestion that it is a Negro problem. "The Negro problem," its Resolutions state, "is a misnomer; it is only incidentally a race but fundamentally an economic one"; also "ninety-five per cent. of Negroes are working people who earn their living by labor power"—therefore Negroes cannot be represented "by parties controlled by large land-owners, manufacturers, bankers, railroad magnates, trusts, syndicates, and monopolists." Among the constructive measures they advocated were unionization of all Negro workers, the formation of Tenant Leagues which would "organize rent strikes, thereby requiring owners to give better service and reduce rents," the forming of cooperative societies both for consumption and production, and of "boycott committees" to reduce the cost of living and secure courteous service for merchants and business men. To racial discrimination as such, the one target of the National Association, the Friends of Negro Freedom give little attention. All the demands contained in the various Resolutions of the National Association are included by them in one sweeping statement which concludes by urging "the relegation to oblivion of every form of race and color distinction in every country of the world," not so much in the interests of abstract justice as because they stand in the way of

the international solidarity of the working class.

The Friends of Negro Freedom is in every sense a younger movement than the National Association. It is undoubtedly more radical than the latter organization, and to the present writer it seems at once a more fundamental and more forward-looking movement. But there is no doubt that its existence was made possible by the pioneer work of the National Association and that the work of each must for years to come supplement that of the other. To a people submerged under so enormous and complicated a mass of double-edged injustices as that which oppresses the bulk of the Negro population in the United States, both as laborers and members of a weaker race, no liberating movement can fail to be of importance. It is significant also that while the work of the National Association has begun to penetrate the hitherto solid and impregnable South, the Southern frontier of the Friends of Negro Freedom (at least for work in the open) is the comparatively Northerly and industrial state of Virginia. The work of the National Association has been to raise the level of the Negro to that of an articulate element in our civilization. Whether his self-expression will be in the direction indicated by the Friends of Negro Freedom or not remains to be seen.

On Nominating a President

BY ALBERT DE SILVER

IN the lobby of the Blackstone—the one cool spot (artificially cool) in all sweltering Chicago during Convention Week—one sees familiar faces. Judge Gary is there. And Mr. Henry P. Davidson, and Mr. Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan & Co. So are Herbert L. Satterlee and Mrs. Ogden Reid, and John Hays Hammond. And there are many gorgeously gowned women, too. It might be the anteroom of the Charity Ball in New York if one did not also see other faces as well—Senator Borah, Murray Crane, the President of the Irish Republic, Cabot Lodge, Frank Brandegee, Conde Nast, George Harvey. A strange crowd, a motley crowd—these men and women who stop at the Blackstone and make presidents. . . .

It is unbearably hot in the Coliseum. The fourteen thousand delegates and spectators have just finished listening to Senator Jim Watson of Indiana read the Platform as contained in the Majority Report of the Resolutions Committee—that platform which denounced the President and the Democrats for everything except the hot weather, which discussed every issue before the country (except the Irish agitation) and laid down a definite program for none of them. They had cheered the declaration of opposition to government ownership and employee operation of the railroads; they had

cheered a Mexican plank which promised to protect by force every American oil and mining concession in Mexico; they had cheered a plank which denied the right of a resident alien even to criticize American institutions, and one which denied the right to strike against the Government; and they had made it clear that this unbossed Convention would have cheered any plank were it only sufficiently reactionary. The delegates were safe. They would stand without hitching.

At that point there stepped forward upon the rostrum a brave man. It was not Senator Borah, nor yet the doughty Senator from California. It was Mr. Edwin J. Gross, a delegate from Wisconsin. He was greeted by a chorus of hoots. The body of the delegates did not like Wisconsin very well. The Chairman, Mr. Lodge, pounded for order. Mr. Gross, he said, desired to submit a minority report signed by himself. The hoots commenced again. Mr. Gross waited quietly until the Coliseum was as nearly quiet as it ever is with fourteen thousand people in it, and began:

"Men and women of this Convention," he said, "it is my conviction that the platform which has just been read to you does not represent the will or the desires of the American People, and it is therefore my wish to submit the following minority re-

port and to move its adoption." He commenced reading: "We condemn the Treaty of Versailles as an utter denial of international right and justice. We believe it to be a repudiation of every pledge made when the United States entered the war, and a betrayal of our national honor and interest alike. We refuse to acquiesce in the rape of China, or in the legalization of the subjection of India, Ireland, and Egypt, and we demand the complete and unequivocal rejection by the Senate of the entire treaty." Many of the delegates saw in this only more criticism of the democratic administration and applauded. Mr. Gross continued: "We demand the immediate restoration of the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage." Here he looked up from his manuscript: "And this means some of you delegates, too, not just democrats."

He went on. His platform demanded the repeal of the Espionage Act, international disarmament, and expressed opposition to universal military training in peace time. Hisses began to come from the audience. He denounced the Esch-Cummins transportation act. More hisses came. He said that the party should stand for public ownership and operation of the railroads. The chorus of disapproval grew. He mentioned the gradual acquisition by the people of terminal warehouses and stock-yards, and a storm of hisses, hoots and cat-calls drowned him out completely. Cries of "socialism," "anarchy," "put him out," came from all over the great building.

Mr. Gross appeared completely unmoved. He waited patiently. Senator Lodge came forward and rapped for order. The crowd continued to hoot. At last the Senator made himself heard and roared (as nearly as a dignified Senator from Massachusetts can) that Mr. Gross *must* be permitted to continue. Mr. Gross *did* continue—in dead silence. And he finished in dead silence.

It can perhaps be understood why it was during the balloting that hisses came from every part of the Coliseum when the Chairman of the Wisconsin delegation upon every vote announced with a ringing challenge in his voice that Wisconsin cast twenty-four votes for Robert M. LaFollette.

I went back to the Blackstone and stepped into the elevator to see a friend on one of the upper floors. There stepped in also a Senator from a New England State, and a gentleman from Wisconsin whom I do not know. "I suppose that fellow from Wisconsin this afternoon was a friend of yours," said the Senator, banteringly. The gentleman from Wisconsin looked grieved. "I don't know you well enough, Senator," he said, "to tell you what I think of that remark. You see," he went on, "LaFollette and Berger and those socialists give us an awful lot of trouble in our State."

I rode out to the Coliseum with a delegate from Oklahoma. We talked about Governor Smith of New York and his vetoes of the anti-socialist bills. "They were good vetoes," said the gentleman from the Southwest. "What was the matter with those

fellows at Albany, anyway? Were they crazy?" "Something like that," said I. "They were just seeing things. They thought the socialists were going to upset the government or something of the sort." "Well," he said, "we don't have any trouble with radicals out our way. We just squash 'em." I looked inquisitive. "Yes," he went on, "there aren't very many of them and we fix 'em. A club or a piece of rope or tar and feathers. We don't have any trouble out our way."

The fifth ballot for the nominee for the presidency of the United States had just been completed. Governor Lowden of Illinois had taken the lead for the first time. He had made substantial gains overnight, but General Wood was still close behind him. The tall gentleman with the big voice who called the roll began again. Lowden seemed to be gaining more votes. His cheering section was getting noisier with every State that was called. I heard a commotion at the entrance by which I was sitting. A crowd of men had come in. They carried large American flags furled, and banners with Lowden's picture. Back of them, outside in the alleyway, was a very considerable crowd of men and boys bearing placards on sticks and inscribed "FRANK O. LOWDEN, THE MAN OF THE HOUR," "LOWDEN, OUR NEXT PRESIDENT," and with other tasteful sentiments. It was an odd-looking crowd. They looked about like a dollar a head. The man at my right looked over at them. "Looks like the Lowden crowd are going to try to stampee the Convention. If he gains enough on the next ballot," he said, "I hope to Hell they get away with it." But Lowden didn't gain enough on the next ballot. He and General Wood tied, and the stampee didn't come off. Lowden lost steadily from then on until the ninth ballot when, after the leaders had conferred during recess, he threw the support of his delegates to Senator Harding, the great statesman, to quote Congressman Willis' nominating speech, "whose record for the past fifteen years has been the record of the Republican Party."

Croesus as Propagandist

THE election in Germany showed conclusively the failure of the coalition government to win the strong allegiance of any class. For the present some sort of compromise government may be set up, but the election figures presage a more acute conflict between out-and-out international socialism and a capitalistic nationalism. There is food for reflection in the amazing gains of the German People's Party (described as "moderate, conservative, and anti-Semitic") whose leading figure is the great capitalist Herr Stinnes. It is explained that he quietly bought up sixty-four papers to push his propaganda. How much real democracy is there so long as the possession of enormous wealth makes possible this control of the avenues of information and discussion on which democracy must be based?

Americanism Cross-Pollinated

By ORLAND O. NORRIS

THERE are fifty-seven thousand varieties of Americanism in these United States. They trail a riot of verbose festoonery over pulpit, platform, and editorial room. Some are fair to behold; some are poisonous to humankind; and many bear fruits too small to pay for the picking. As the election season draws on apace it may be well to classify them and take stock of the varieties that we shall care to grow.

In spite of their great number, however, they are all reducible to four genera, one of these being an impossible hybrid.

First in order of appearance is Americana Democratica Jeffersonia. Its most notable fruit has been the Declaration of Independence. Seed from this has been carried abroad and planted in nearly every state of the Union, where they have grown and flourished to the great benefit of men. The type is a vigorous grower, a close second to Jonah's gourd of old-time fame. It has not a fixed character, but produces wide variations, such as the Doctrine of States' Rights and the doctrine of the individual's right to booze in spite of the State. The explanation of its riotous, irrepressible growth is that it produces a great mass of roots which spread far and wide in the shallow but fertile soil of sentiment and humanitarian abstraction, a compost of leaf-mold that is a great nourisher of leaves, but of fruit almost not at all. It should be noted that the plant has a decidedly staminate character. The leaves when masticated are a great stimulant of oratory; and this pleasing characteristic, together with the fact that its root is well adapted for potting, makes it a favorite decorative plant with oratorical preachers, Chataqua lecturers, daily-press editors, and campaign speakers. Another result of chewing the leaves is to affect the vision, often making white appear black and black white, according as the subject desires.

Second in order of development is Americana Republicana Hamiltonia. This is a rugged, sturdy grower. It is not a prolific plant, but the fruit that it bears is large and solid. Its chief fruit has been the national Constitution. But, as the original Constitution was too hard and woody for Anglo-Saxon digestion, cross-pollination with Jeffersonia was found necessary. The first experiment, made by the transfer of ten grains of pollen, in the form of Amendments, not only increased the size of the fruit but also made it far more palatable and healthful generally. Several later experiments of the same kind have been made, and in fact constant care of this kind is required to counteract a persistent tendency to reversion, and to keep it producing edible and digestible fruit. Chief among the

fruits of the pure Hamiltonian strain are a reactionary Senate, trusts, monopolies, sweatshops, and a large number of enormous private fortunes. The plant is inclined to be pistillate; and while it puts forth a profusion of gorgeous flowers in the nature of private art galleries, yachts, mansions, library buildings, and privately endowed colleges, it shows a constant tendency to blight, which manifests itself in millions of starved buds whose proper sustenance is diverted and appropriated to the production of its characteristically mammoth and sport-like bloom and fruit. Probably the chief reason for this fact is that its long, naked tap-root finds its natural and most congenial soil in the greed of wealth, power, family prestige, and posthumous fame. Owing to its comparative sterility, it is only the wealthy and those who aspire to wealth that care to grow it as a leading crop. Like those of Jeffersonia, its leaves when chewed have decidedly stimulating effects. One of these is to make the subject see red. Another is to stimulate fear, so that the wealthy subject calls loudly for police, militia, or other constituted forces to defend his unequal privileges and perquisites. Whether this latter is a cause or an effect of his seeing red, or whether the two phenomena are causally unrelated, is not yet definitely known. Owing to its natural hardihood, Hamiltonia is splendidly adapted for the purpose of covering fine old churches, aristocratic mansions, and college "halls."

Recognizing the good and bad qualities of both Jeffersonia and Hamiltonia, expert growers a few years ago endeavored to produce a hybrid that would manifest the good of both and lack the bad. The result was Americana Republicana Progressiva Rooseveltia. The plant gave wonderful promise. Nurserymen did a thriving business with it from Maine to California, save in the Southern states, where Jeffersonia finds its native soil in greatest purity and abundance, and where it has long been a great favorite. In California especially the plant grew with hot-house luxuriance for a time; but here, as everywhere else, the strain soon lost its vigor and distinctive character, and reverted to the type of the parent Hamiltonia. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it quite completely petered out, like the old-time peach-blow potato. It possessed the root characteristics of both Hamiltonia and Jeffersonia, and here is probably to be found the cause of its short career. The two soils thus exploited for its sustenance furnished ingredients of such incompatible reactions that no plant could flourish upon them. Large growers who had fallen for the new creation have mostly reverted to the culture of Hamiltonia; many of

the smaller growers, even though they had formerly favored Hamiltonia, have developed a decided preference for Jeffersonia.

Recently a new variety of Americana has been slowly coming to the front. It will probably be named Americana Democratica Humanistis Speciosa. The seed were imported from England, whence both Jeffersonia and Hamiltonia had originally come.

A closely related plant, of European culture, should be mentioned here. Before the Americans had yet developed a taste for Humanistis, some of the seed were carried to the Continent, where in the course of time they fell into the hands of Friedrich Nietzsche. The Herr Doktor carefully planted them in Prussia, in a composite soil of nationalism and autocracy, such as that country afforded in abundance. The result of soil and care was a wonderful plant, Prussiana Darwinia Nietzscheia Superhumanica. It was a rapid grower, and was marvelously prolific on its native soil. Moreover, it showed unusual powers of adaptability. It would thrive beyond belief upon American soil. But this is perhaps due to the presence here of nationalism in great abundance, a highly complex soil with greed as one of its chief constituents. Before the late war we had many growers, mostly Germans, intent upon exploiting the plant here. But in Europe, where it had already become established, it was found to be poisonous, and all the farmers neighboring to Germany, over which it had spread, had to turn out and scotch it to save themselves, and the Germans too. The result has been quite thoroughly to stamp it out here in America. But some of the more wealthy and conservative citizens had already laid in a supply of the leaves, with which they regale themselves from time to time. Mixed with Hamiltonia, they form a very pleasing and ingratiating blend, but a mixture of Nietzscheia and Jeffersonia will make the user violently ill.

The leaves of Nietzscheia when eaten had a decided tendency to "go to the head," much more so than those of either Jeffersonia or Hamiltonia, and there they produce an effect little short of megalomania. They make the subject think his family and his countrymen superior to the common herd and entitled by nature to rule the whole earth; hence it is that the name of Superhumanica was derived. One effect upon the Prussians was to make them conjure up visions of their own future supremacy over the whole human race, to make them talk a great deal about "kultur," "civilization," and "progress," and to think that the human race lives for the sake of progress. Another was to make them boldly give expression to their unnatural and unwarranted notions of their own superiority in the form of such phrases as "world leadership," "Prussia against the world," "Prussian supremacy." Americans who have eaten of the leaves of Nietzscheia are similarly affected. They talk incessantly of "progress," "civilization," "world lead-

ership," "American supremacy," "hundred-per-cent. Americanism," and other such arrant and arrogant nonsense. A favorite slogan with them is "America for Americans; to hell with the Japanese, the Mexicans, and the aliens!" It may be inferred from the attitude thus engendered that the chief effect of the plant is to dull the moral perception, especially in international and inter-racial relationships. It is to be hoped that the store of Nietzscheia will soon be exhausted.

But to return to Humanistis Speciosa. Its root is longer and more branching than that of Hamiltonia, reaching down into the subsoil of fundamental human nature, far below the surface of personal, family, and national greed. The plant thus draws its nourishment from the fountains of Life itself, which cares primarily for the species, and only secondarily for the nation, institution, and individual,—in fact, caring for these only in so far as they minister to the continuity of life of the species, and inspiring true and abiding happiness only in those who helpfully participate in that culture and in those movements which seem to further the success of this process.

But not only does Humanistis Speciosa far surpass all other varieties of Americana in its length of root, its obvious hardihood, and in the quality of its fruit, but it transcends them all in the beneficent qualities of its leaves. Their use has neither the mildly illusory effects of Jeffersonia, nor the more violently hallucinatory effects of either Hamiltonia or Nietzscheia; there is no need of comparison with the all but extinct Rooseveltia. The effects of its leaves are to increase personal energy and its control, to clarify and intensify the social vision, and to stimulate a healthful interest in concrete human values—body, mind, food, health, housing, clothing, recreation, education, art for the public. In this respect it differs widely from Jeffersonia, which stimulates an interest in abstractions—as justice, liberty, equality, opportunity—as if attention to abstractions would create realities. It causes the user to discern that all races have an equal right to the earth for the purposes of social living and of socially participating in the species' struggle for existence; that the species does not live in order to progress, but progresses as the fundamental condition of continued existence; that the test of progress is the question of increased self-sufficiency of the species to live another million years; and that if we take care of the realities, none but right abstractions can be derived from our efforts. Its use inspires a special kind of loyalty—loyalty to species welfare.

Surely Humanistis Speciosa is the plant of which the prophet dreamed in times of old, whose leaves should be for the healing of the nations. Surely it is the only one of all the varieties of Americana that can be unhesitatingly recommended for culture during the coming season, and through the years to come.

Our Caribbean Empire

THE average citizen of the United States is blissfully ignorant of the extent to which this government has established a colonial empire in the Caribbean regions. In Nicaragua the government is practically in the hands of the United States marines. The natives complain not merely that they are ruled without their consent but that they are subject to the whims of our Navy Department which in this matter is responsible neither to Congress nor the people. The American Government is also charged with unwarranted interference in Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Honduras. At a recent conference at Clark University, Judge Otto Schoenrich, a conservative citizen, born in America, who has held high judicial posts in Porto Rico and is familiar with all the Caribbean countries, read a paper reviewing the record of the American administration of the two island republics, Santo Domingo and Haiti. The first, it will be recalled, is Spanish-speaking and predominantly white; the second French-speaking and Negro. In 1916 our Navy took over the government of Santo Domingo, and administers it through the marines against the wishes of the people. "Law and order" have been established. Roads have been built and a beginning has been made at popular education. The reason for our intervention was the failure of the Dominican Government to live up to its agreement in the matter of its foreign debt. Foreign bond-holders now get their interest regularly! Judge Schoenrich, however, charges that in accomplishing these things the United States government has maintained a censorship so rigid as to apply to every public statement "from the utterances of the chief justice to an advertisement for a servant girl." Until recently the words, *national, revolution, freedom of thought and speech* could not appear in a Dominican publication. One unfortunate bookseller was originally sentenced to five years in prison for circulating a speech by the speaker of the Porto Rican House of Representatives. Later his sentence was graciously commuted to banishment. Judge Schoenrich also reports serious charges of torture in connection with the administration of the provost courts.

In the neighboring republic of Haiti conditions are even more unsatisfactory. There we intervened on the nominal authority of a treaty, but the Haitian Congress only ratified that treaty with twenty-three reservations which we ignored. In 1916 marines dispersed the Congress and in 1917 dispersed a Constituent Assembly. Tell it not to Trotzky! Judge Schoenrich says there are three governments: the Haitian, the government of the American treaty officials, and the government of the American military. The first is impotent, the second inefficient, and the third indifferent. In the

interior districts of the island the officers of the marines exercise despotic powers and the natives charge that a marine can do no wrong to a Haitian. From Haiti also come ugly stories of torture, autocracy and unjust trials of civilians by provost court, and denials of civil liberty. A few months ago armed Haitians, either bandits or revolutionists according to the point of view, actually marched on the capital city where there was vigorous fighting before they were dispersed. The Haitian debt was largely held by the people, who, lacking proper banking facilities, put their savings into national bonds. Under American occupation payment on these was suspended although it was guaranteed in the Treaty. The people sold their holdings at low prices. The bonds, it is believed, are now held by New York bankers, and negotiations are under way looking to their payment at par.

It is only fair to say that such criticisms as these were vigorously attacked at the Clark University Conference by defenders of the American regime. They are, however, supported by other testimony. Archbishop Nouel of Santo Domingo in a letter to the American Minister (we go through the farce of maintaining a Minister plenipotentiary in a country ruled by an American Rear Admiral) complains not only of torture, of the denial of liberty, but of a faulty system of taxation and waste in its expenditure.* Emphatically the situation requires investigation. The Navy Department is ruling three republics without their consent primarily in the interests of their American creditors, with a blissful irresponsibility even as regards Congress or the American public. Supposing that conditions in Nicaragua, Santo Domingo, and Haiti prior to our intervention were as bad as their critics assert—it is a sorry world if we can discover no way of helping to educate "backward" people without subjecting them to flagrant economic and political imperialism.

And Porto Rico

PORTO RICO welcomed American annexation and her case is not on all fours with her neighbor's. Nevertheless, our territorial rule leaves something to be desired. During the year 1917-'18 only 142,846 children out of 427,668 of school age were actually enrolled in the public schools. The total wealth of the Island is in the hands of fifteen

* Archbishop Nouel is warmly praised in a little pamphlet by Samuel Guy Inman on his trip through Santo Domingo and Haiti. Mr. Inman was primarily interested in working out a constructive programme for religious and educational work, and on political matters he speaks with a cautious disapproving tone who is familiar with his vigorous protests against Mexican intervention. Even so, one may read between the lines considerable doubt as to the perfection of the American government.

per cent. of the population; fourteen per cent. is in the hands of native Porto Ricans, sixty-seven per cent. in the hands of Americans. Wages, housing,

and health conditions are wretched. The extension of this sort of thing in Mexico and the Caribbean countries is not our idea of civilizing people.

What of Japan?

A VIEW FROM WITHIN

II

A VERY large part of Japan's social and moral awakening is rooted in Christianity, though often unconsciously. For Japanese rarely give credit for anything they receive from others. Many prominent authors have achieved their fame by the simple process of translating Occidental classics and attaching their own names as authors. Foreign merchandise is copied to the smallest detail and sold at home as Japanese in its creation, and abroad under the trade-mark of the original. It is not any cause for wonder that Japanese religions are adopting much of Christian methods and even Christian teaching and clothing themselves proudly in the borrowed garments. Many a time have I heard children in a Buddhist Sunday School singing lustily "Buddha loves me, this I know" to a tune familiar to every Christian Sunday School attendant the world over. In Tokyo the Buddhists have built a large "institutional" church copying a Christian institution a few blocks away. Having the building, their present problem seems to be to find a use for it and to induce the people to use it. Its most conspicuous activity thus far has been to serve as the center from which Buddhist students started out to stone the new Salvation Army Headquarters! The Buddhist "Scriptures," bound and printed like Bibles, are easily obtainable, and they contain much that is taken bodily from the Christian Bible, with the name of Buddha substituted for that of Jesus. This is making for new vigor in Buddhism, though it cannot last forever. Shinto likewise profits by Occidental methods. Buddhism and Shintoism, the latter in particular, hold a monopoly on Japanese patriotism and fit in with the designs of militarists. They are realizing the power of Christianity and fighting it vigorously, charging it with being the cause of the democratic movements and with spreading the "dangerous thoughts that are undermining the Empire."

The direct political influence of Christianity and missionaries is small. The missionary is not a subject of Japan and her politics are not his business. But Japan's character is very properly in his province. If he succeeds in transforming the character of the people, the politics will take care of themselves. That line of reasoning is often judged old-fashioned in our day; but let us Westerners not be led astray by the Socialist dream of a Utopia achieved simply through a perfect governmental

and economic theory. That illusion is forever blind to the real force in life—personality. Economics are powerful in their shaping influence, but personality is no creature of mere economics. When one comes up against the age-old customs of heathenism (yes, heathenism—I use the word advisedly, though I used to say "ethnic faiths" and other polite terms), he finds that the only road to progress is by the slow, painful achievement of individual character that can rise above custom, economic limitations, heredity, and political restraints. Such character can create new customs, sound political life, just economics. Having produced true men and women of vision, larger social changes are automatic.

TOWARDS DEMOCRACY

Another increasingly powerful force in Japan is the direct movement for more democracy. The two Japanese words expressing that idea having been banned by the vigilant police, "*de-mo-ku-ra-shi*" has become a household word, as yet little understood but increasingly denoting an ideal of power and beauty. A most instructive article on *Recent Democratic Tendencies in Japan*, by Dr. U. Kawaguchi, is found in the Baptist Mission's Annual for 1919. His outline of the different phases of the movement is worth reproducing briefly.

The oldest democratic movement is that represented by Dr. Inoue of Tokyo Imperial University, who said that there are two kinds of democracy, one signifying government by the people, the other government for the good of the people. He points out that Japan has always been, by the grace of her Emperors, in the latter class. He still advocates this kind of "democracy," saying that the idea of sovereignty residing in the people is a crude, narrow, Western kind of democracy, leading inevitably to the establishment of a republic. That is unthinkable in Japan, for she already possesses this finer kind of democracy, a legacy from the most ancient times! *Ergo*, we have discovered the original democracy! I have met people who implicitly believe that the electric light, the steamboat, the street car—all are Japanese inventions copied by scheming foreigners. So it is only natural that Democracy should be included.

But since the war, with its defeat of Germany, the All-Perfect, Japan has had an awakening. Other kinds of democracy are advocated in these days and Dr. Inoue is becoming a relic. Dr. Yoshino, a Christian professor at the same University, is rec-

ognized by many as Democracy's foremost champion in Japan. He admits that the kind of democracy in which the power resides wholly in the people is in contradiction to the existing form of government, and so advocates "government for the benefit and happiness of the whole people, taking their wishes into consideration." In other words, the people should participate in the affairs of government. The only road to democracy in Japan seems to be such as he indicates: an evolution like England's, where the monarch is preserved as a beloved heritage from the past, a visible symbol of the historic continuity of the nation.

Later writers, such as Professor Ukita of Waseda University, talk of social democracy and maintain that this is in a fair way to be achieved in Japan before the fulfilment of political democracy.

One cannot enumerate the many democratic tendencies in modern Japan. Higher education is being made available to a larger circle, instead of the comparative few who could pass the rigid entrance examinations of the few institutions. The highest authority still defines education as having for its sole object the benefit of the State: the pursuit of knowledge and truth being left to other countries, apparently. Still, it is good to see the liberalizing tendencies in higher education, even though the military regime still controls the primary schools.

Another powerful expression of democratic leanings is the movement for general manhood suffrage. This has attained such proportions that the Premier lately dissolved the Diet on the plea of the danger involved in the demonstrations. It is rumored that there are other and deeper reasons. Like other things affecting the welfare of Japan, the "deeper reasons" will doubtless remain unknown to the public!

To a foreigner it appears that the clamor for suffrage is in many quarters a cry for a new toy rather than an intelligent demand for more democracy. Were the meaning of suffrage more generally understood, the clamor would also demand a suffrage carrying with it real power in place of the privilege of doubtful value now enjoyed by property classes. There is no space here in which to enlarge upon the degree to which Japan's constitutional monarchy is simply the building of an Occidental front on a truly Oriental system. The powers of the Emperor deserve more than a casual scrutiny. (See *Japan Year Book* for summary). Remember the complete independence of the military power from the civil, and note the difficulties experienced by an often sincere and honest civil government in inducing the military to conform to its diplomatic agreements. Witness the pouring of Japanese troops into Siberia in complete defiance of the Allied agreement restricting the number supplied by each power. In the absence of definite information, it is not an entirely idle speculation that the military powers simply poured their thou-

sands of troops into Siberia from Manchuria when they got ready to do so, and told the civil and diplomatic authorities to twiddle their thumbs while the real bosses of the country carried out their aims. But there are many signs of a growing popular distrust of the military and an increasing amount of authority in the hands of the civil government. The agitation against the continued presence of Japanese troops in Siberia is a most encouraging sign of popular impatience with militarism.

LABOR INCREASINGLY ARTICULATE

Another complication, but a true sign of the times, is the growing power of labor. Strikes are the order of the day. Police orders make striking risky business, so the latest weapon of labor is the policy of "*taigyo*," or literally, "go-slow." This is not a strike and so not legally punishable, though doubtless it will soon become so. It consists in going to work as usual and then becoming sick, or allowing one's machine to break, or merely going through the motions but doing no work. Sometimes even the motions are dispensed with and the workmen sit around charcoal fires and smoke while they condemn the capitalists. This method is very effective in scaring concessions from employers, but has little good effect upon the employees in the long run, for habits of scamping work are good for no one. It is nevertheless the only way labor has found to loosen the capitalist stranglehold even a little. There will be no escape as long as both sides are purely selfish. Some firms have voluntarily raised wages, shortened hours, and improved working conditions, but competition for labor is usually the motive. "Japan's abundance of cheap labor," favorite phrase of anti-Japanese agitators, is fast becoming a myth. The number of strikes in 1914 was fifty; in 1918 it was four hundred and seventeen, and in 1919 probably passed the thousand mark. 1920 may break that record. Labor is increasingly articulate and its power is growing, though it is still far behind Western lands. The Government, as usual, picked the labor "delegates" to the Washington conference, and the "*Yuaikai*," the oldest labor organization, was on hand when the delegates sailed, to "see them off." The laborers held a splendid funeral on the pier, informing the world that it was for their beloved "delegate" as a token of their hopes for him. A day or so before, the police had taken the precaution of clapping in jail every man who could be expected to lead in any sort of demonstration, but the workers held their funeral without leaders.

Our list of hopeful signs must not omit the increasing freedom of speech. Daily events do not seem like "increasing freedom," but that is only because the background is forgotten. Many magazines run articles regularly that two years ago would have been suppressed. Speeches are permitted which would have been called treason a few years past. Of course these are often only mildly

progressive, and anything a bit more liberal gets suppressed, as certain liberal leaders have lately discovered to their sorrow—but the Hara regime is still the most liberal one Japan has ever enjoyed. The railway officials and station masters no longer wear their swords and emblems of rank—an innovation scarcely a year old. Most remarkable of all, the new regulations regarding Imperial travel provide that the Emperor's coach may, if necessary, be attached to ordinary trains and that people need not leave the station when he alights. The people may even remain in a station waiting-room when the Emperor is present, if the station has no special waiting room for him. School children are no longer required to come from miles around and line up alongside the track, standing for hours uncovered in the sun or rain, waiting for the Imperial train to whiz past. Local officials try to show their zeal by keeping up these old customs, and most of the people like to show their reverence for the Emperor this way: but the nominal abolition of the old regulations opens the way for a healthy and normal affection of the people for their ruler. When Japan takes her Emperor down off the god-shelf and learns to love him instead of worshipping him, the root of autocracy will be cut and the way opened for Japan to develop spiritual and moral greatness. And the power of militarism will be broken.

The field of social reform without political action is increasingly cultivated. There are significant efforts by foreign missionaries and some really fundamental tasks are being tackled by Japanese. Mr. T. Kagawa, of Kobe, an American-trained man, is notable in this field. He has a real love of his country and the deep kind of patriotism which is not afraid of sacrifice. He lives in a tiny apartment in Kobe's worst slum (perhaps the worst slum in the world), and without much material equipment he has devoted his energies to reaching the hearts of his people, so he is constantly gaining influence among the workmen, women, and children of the slums. Recently he was arrested for some radical remark, and his fine of 100 yen was gladly paid by a friend. A Japanese in recounting the incident to the writer said with a laugh—"Why, anyone would pay a hundred yen to keep Kagawa out of jail!" Such work as his will surely bring Japan nearer to the Kingdom of Heaven. No movement toward a better Japan can succeed till the people learn sacrifice, service, and love of others.

THE NEED OF MORAL REVOLUTION

The fundamental fact in Japan's progress will be moral. When the moral revolution sweeps Japan, other changes will follow. Revolutions before that one will be mere fruitless struggles for power.

There is a lot of wasted energy in many "efforts for better international understanding." What is needed isn't better understanding—it's Justice. Nations which understand each other can never-

theless fight like dogs. Only justice prevents war. The only course for us is to strive to make and keep America's hands clean, and to do what we can to help Japan wash her own hands before a crash comes. Japan is indeed making some sincere efforts to clean them—witness some real reforms in Korea. But these are discredited and foiled all too often by the arrogant displays of the power of the militarists, proving that Japan's fight to clean herself is barely begun.

Some Japanese will call this indictment unfair, saying that Japan is not a militaristic nation. Others will say that the remarks about the growth of democracy are an insult to Japan and that by saying such movements are growing in power I am exposing Japan's weakness and shame to the world. The average Japanese does not know much more about his own nation than he knows about the rest of the world. He has no standard of judgment except Japan herself. When the One Father God has replaced the Emperor as the object of Japan's worship, she will have a true standard by which to judge herself.

These observations may appear inconsistent. Perhaps that is their claim to accuracy. We have said that Japan is a world-menace, and that she is progressing toward democracy; that the militarists have absolute power, and that the civil government is growing in power and often acts contrary to the will of the militarists. Of course the picture is inconsistent. So is Japan. Every one of her subjects reserves to himself the right of unlimited inconsistency. No foreigner can trace the devious wanderings of the Oriental mind. Japan doesn't fit Western premises. Nations are always inconsistent, for they contain many groups.

Japan hates America—and Japan loves America. Her newspapers at the direction of the bureaucrats heap daily abuse on America's head: the people agree with the papers—and secretly long for a chance to visit that wonderful land beyond the sea. Her students drill that they may defeat her; and long to be like her and study in America. The noisy anti-American propaganda exists because of the powerful pro-American, pro-democracy sentiment. The same men who are pro-American and pro-democracy would doubtless respond instantly to a call to arms against America. Why? Neither the writer nor the Japanese themselves have the answer. There is too much of the mentally-disorganized savage under the semi-civilized exterior of Japan to make it easy to trace her mental processes. No one can predict the future certainly. Nor are any of us in a position to condemn Japan unqualifiedly, for there is too much of glass in our own houses to make rock-throwing a pleasant pastime.

Only the conquest of Japan by love can improve matters permanently, and when both Japan and America are in the Kingdom of Heaven, such problems will disappear.

The Strike

A Symposium (concluded)

Labor Largely Its Own Employer

By HUDSON MAXIM

THE best way to deal with the strike problem, in my opinion, is for the Government to exercise its right of eminent domain over affairs which vitally concern the common weal, and to enact a law which shall require both employers and employees to live up to the agreements they make with each other.

Let Labor have the right of collective bargaining with Capital, and make it compulsory for both Capital and Labor to keep their agreements. Nearly all recent strikes have been in violation of agreements made with employers.

When workmen are ordered to strike by the leaders of their Union, the strike has for its object the making of a new bargain with employer or employers, and almost always the strike breaks an old bargain to compel Capital, by a new bargain, to grant better terms, and if better terms are granted and a new bargain made with the Union, the Union does not consider itself bound to live up to its part of the agreement, but it expects Capital to carry out its part of the agreement to the very letter.

An agreement is not an agreement, and in law is not recognized as an agreement, unless both parties are equally bound by it.

Every strike is a blow aimed at the common welfare. Every strike is a blow aimed at the social order, for the entire social body must bear the burden of the loss in production caused by the strike, the wages lost by the strikers, and the profits lost by Capital, and Labor and Capital must jointly participate in bearing this burden.

Every man who participates in a strike also participates in raising the cost of his own living, and every working man in the country who strikes, not only strikes against Capital, but also strikes against every other working man in the country, because of the increased cost of living which his act produces.

Working men erroneously presume that they are the only employees, and that capitalists are a class of employers, while, as a matter of fact, every Capitalist who employs labor is himself an employee of labor, and the profits which the capitalist makes constitute his wages. There is no dividing line between Capital and Labor.

The working men of this country are owners of vast interests in the businesses of the country. A very large amount of the stock in many of the leading corporations of the country is owned by working men, and there is little difference indeed between the labor leader of the Union and the leader

of Capital employing working men, for the capitalist-employer himself is merely a labor leader. He serves Labor and serves the public, and the profits he makes are his wages.

Strikes and Their Preventative

By FRANK L. MORRISON

WHILE causes for strikes exist, trade unionists know of no method by which strikes can be avoided. It is possible to minimize strikes, and even to reduce them to negligible quantity, but this is not possible where strike causes are ignored, where industrial autocracy prevails, and where the injunction process and other governmental aid are at the disposal of the employer.

The demand for legislation to stop strikes, or to regulate them—which is, in practice, the same thing—rests on the theory that the rights of the public are interfered with. Anti-strike legislation advocates, however, ignore that concomitant with rights are duties. One of equity's first principles is that a plaintiff must come into court with clean hands. Is it too much to ask that this principle be accepted by men who talk about the public's rights? This public's-rights claim, when analyzed, will be found to mean the public's convenience and the public's disregard for conditions that impel men to strike.

From the standpoint of equity, the public's duties are as important as the public's rights. Once this elemental of justice is accepted, a social consciousness will be developed, rather than have wrongs of the workers forced upon the public mind by inconveniencing the public. This appeal to force on the part of the workers is often answered by force on the part of the public, with the two movements dividing a community, engendering hatreds and retarding a people's orderly development.

Anti-strike legislation advocates seem to think they have discovered a new theory, but we find in Thorold Rogers's *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* that the plan now in vogue in a middle-western state is identical with laws existing during the reign of Edward of England in 1347. The Kansas law provides that wages shall be set by an industrial court, appointed by the Governor. Over five hundred years ago the English law provided that the Lord's Court should set wages. Strikes were penalized, as in Kansas. Every student of history knows the result of the English legislation, and a man need not be a prophet to say that the Kansas venture will eventually travel the same road.

Australia is the most modern example of compulsory arbitration, wages by law, and anti-strike legislation. Only recently that continent was acclaimed as "the land without strikes." Last year the Federated Business Men's Organization of Australia appointed a committee to investigate social unrest. The committee's report, printed in *Liberty and Progress* (an employers' publication), Melbourne, issue November 25, 1919, stated:

"It is obvious after an experience of twenty years that our industrial laws have lamentably failed to secure industrial peace."

The Two Tests

By A. J. MUSE.

YOU have asked me to make some comment on the question of the ethics of the strike discussed in your May issue. In the space and time at my disposal I can make but one or two brief remarks.

If the worker does not strike, what alternative does he have? The supposition is that appeals to the generosity or sense of justice of the employer, to public opinion, to legislative action, have failed to bring relief. This is actually the case in most strikes. The worker is not a born striker. It is probably true that no change is ever accomplished by direct action that would not long before have been accomplished through legislative enactment; for example, if the will of the people could actually get itself expressed at the ballot-box. What alternative, then, has the worker? The alternative of remaining at work, bearing the ills he has rather than flying to others that he knows not of.

But what does this mean? It means that he is actively supporting, helping to perpetuate, a monstrous evil. This system that he not only passively endures but helps to keep going by his labor, kills innocent children, batters on the toil and the virtue of women, makes human beings at the best slaves or cogs in a machine, at the worst devils. Is he justified in not taking the conscientious objector attitude, and saying: "How to get entirely out from under this ungodly thing I know not; but this present phase of it at least is utterly unbearable; I fold my arms"?

I do not want to fall into the error of unduly idealizing the strike or the workers who engage in it. Yet I am convinced that fundamentally the strike means what I have just suggested. It is not in the first instance an attack on the employer or his profits, nor is it an attack on the public. It is an attack on an evil system by folding your arms and refusing to have anything to do for the moment with a particularly wicked phase of it.

But striking means suffering? Yes, and chiefly for the striker. If the strike is an economic blockade, as Mr. Cadbury suggests, we have here a case of people blocking themselves. However, it is

true that the strike causes suffering also to others than strikers. So did the attitude toward life that Jesus took. He himself saw clearly enough that his message and deeds meant casting a sword on the earth, setting father against son. Good deeds have painful consequences in an evil world, and if we are going to refrain from any act that may indirectly result in pain to others we shall not act at all.

That a general strike may cause, as Mr. Cadbury suggests, such suffering as a great war entails is indeed possible, but only if the privileged classes take up arms and force such a result. The strikers themselves will see to it, as they did in Seattle and Winnipeg, that hospitals are cared for, milk supplies brought in, etc., if they are given the chance.

Yet when all is said the strike implies compulsion? Doubtless. And can we possibly get away from exerting pressure on each other in this world? And will anyone claim that even material or physical pressure must not sometimes be brought to bear? As by the father who withholds money from the son who spends it in riotous living? It is not so simple to draw the line between physical and spiritual compulsion, or between compulsion and influence. In a world where we have not achieved the absolute there are but two tests, it seems to me, by which we can decide as to whether any form of pressure brought to bear upon one human being by another is such as accords with the Spirit of Christ. One test is the inner motive. Is it love, or something else such as hate or fear? The other is the result. Is it such as recognizes and calls forth the free personality of the other or such as ignores and destroys that personality? By both tests the strike, in its essence, may be, often is, a Christian method. That it does not always achieve the result it seeks is nothing against it. From of old what is unto one a savour of life is unto another a savour of death.

What Labor Needs to Destroy Privilege

By J. P. WARBASSE

A BALE of cotton, a mule and a chattel slave are steps in the evolution of raw material. But when the human being who had been a slave acquired the power to sell his labor, the great step for human freedom was taken; for with that power to sell his labor goes also the power not to sell it.

The struggle to buy labor at a sharp bargain in the competitive market in the interest of profit animates labor to sell itself at the highest possible price. In the presence of an industrial system based on privilege, one is as natural and inevitable as the other. This creates a struggle which amounts to warfare. The workers do not create this antagon-

ism, nor do their interests require it. It is a product of the competition for privilege.

The strike is not an act of violence. It consists in ceasing temporarily to be a party to the struggle. It is a truce in which is demonstrated the appalling fact that society is living by warfare. The exploited worker has as good a right to strike as a slave has to break for liberty or a horse to balk.

The two greatest contributions toward lifting man from a state of industrial slavery have been labor organizations and the strike. Were it not for these, what labor would have received would have been all in the interests of privilege.

Without the strike labor would be condemned to accept the terms which the owners of the land and machines see fit to impose. As to alternatives, there are none. So long as profit remains the motive of industry, the strike is the hope of the human race to prevent its slipping back into slavery.

So long as it is possible for privileged people to live by the toil of others without themselves performing service, so long as labor produces profits which go to those who do not work, labor will ask for more wages. There is no compromise. Nothing remains but the absolute coercion of labor by force; labor then is merely slavery.

Organized capital to promote privilege resorts to every possible agency, in politics, the press, the school, and in the economic field, to cheapen labor. Organized labor with equal justice may employ the strike to attain its ends in any field outside of the immediate industry concerned.

There are no occupations employing labor so vitally necessary that strikes in them should be prohibited. The victory of labor is more vitally necessary than any occupation. It is better that labor be trusted to deal humanely with specific instances of need than that the strike principle be abrogated. Nor am I persuaded that, in the event of a general strike, if the lawyers, doctors and ministers were organized in the ranks of labor, the people would be sent to jail, die and go to hell for want of their services.

There is one present remedy for the strike. That is to concede all that labor asks. Even that concession also means its continuation until labor has squeezed all the profit-privilege out of industry. Anything else means a continuation of industrial warfare.

The strike is a social necessity, *but the strike does not win*. The strike loses because every increase in the cost of production is added to the cost of the commodity or service, and is passed on to the consumer. As the workers constitute the majority of the consumers, labor pays its own increase of wages and the expenses of the strike. And, in addition to this, in these days of sublimated privilege, a little more than the additional cost is tacked on just for the joy of the system.

Along with the potential strike and the actual

strike should go the organization of the workers as consumers. The Cooperative Movement gives labor the approach to the control of what wages will buy. With labor organized in the economic field as consumers and as producers, privilege can be destroyed, access to the good things of life made possible by the performance of service, and labor made honorable and glorious.

The Cooperative Movement trains the workers in the administration of their own industries. In these the main motive for the strike—exploitation for privilege—is absent. In cooperation the motive is service and not private profit. The differences between employer and employee occur not between antagonistic elements but between workers with common interests.

Strikes Justified by Their Spirit

By J. T. DORAN

THE strike, in my opinion, is an absolutely just weapon; when used by working men or women it is, psychologically, an instrument of defense. It is exercised only after all other methods for defending a conception of right standards, as understood by the persons involved as strikers, have failed.

Man, individually, can never rise above *his own* standards, though he is able to develop and broaden his conceptions, thus making possible the acceptance of newer and higher standards. The same holds true for the mass. It never attains to any end higher than the standard conceived by the average to be suitable and just. In new social issues the very nature of the problems and difficulties to be met before coordination of effort is possible, in mass or group activity, tends to produce a psychology, because of the human elements involved, which manifests activity primarily defensive in character.

Before a sufficient degree of unanimity of opinion, determination, and justification favorable to a strike can develop, and assume such proportions as actually to eventuate in a strike, some discussion of the individual, group, or mass interests must be indulged; with the inevitable result that a better and ever improving understanding and appreciation of the complexities of our economic and social interdependence is promoted. Therefore the strike is an instrument for the advancement of mental (or spiritual) and physical growth—for real education. Thus do we attain to the fulfilment of our destined end on earth: the development of a social conscience, and ultimately, spiritual perfection.

That strikes can and do occur seems to me sufficient reason to question the moral and ethical standards peculiar to our social and economic life. That workers do avail themselves of that desperate extreme, the strike, is in itself an indictment against society. To a person who believes, as I do,

in the fundamental wholeness of human nature—in the inherent goodness of man's consciousness in his spirituality—the fact that other human beings are forced to resort to the use of the strike to correct what they conceive to be wrong should be sufficient reason for a close examination of one's social conscience. To the critic I would say: Can your conscience free you from a charge that you, by indifference, antipathy, intolerance, greed, ambition, or ignorance have become the victim of that particularly destructive sin—the sin of omission?

I am convinced that the only measure by which our individual or collective activities may be properly gauged, to determine the righteousness or error of our effort, is by an appreciation of the spirit that actuates. The spirit of the thought or deed is the energizing influence, and determines irrevocably the right or wrong of any thought or act. To know God is to speak with one's own conscience.

The essence of war is brutality, viciousness, despair, and death though it masquerades as heroism, gallantry, courage, and glory. In contrast, strikes spring from a determination to grow, to improve, to hope, to live. The strike is an instrument with which to effect discipline, to compel steadfast recognition of our social responsibilities, to stimulate, to emphasize a desire for justice, freedom, and humanity.

The just way to avoid strikes is to abolish the system that produces them. Capitalism recognizes the right of individuals to own privately the things that are socially necessary and socially operated. Substitute for capitalism a system of production for use and not for profit, the administering of industry by those who operate industry, in the interest of humanity. If certain industries are so vitally necessary to our common welfare that we cannot allow their service to be interrupted, then our common duty demands that there be no cause for complaint on the part of those employed therein. This is a just recognition of social responsibilities. No one group in our present society is or can be economically independent of the rest of the useful workers, and therefore all can be subject to such control as conscience always imposes for justice and human fairness, where man knows not the fear of poverty and economic insecurity.

The strike is a protest, and in my opinion, when squared by the spirit of service for human betterment, should be indulged for any and all purposes that tend to make for that end.

Alternatives to the Strike Examined

A SUMMARY BY NORMAN THOMAS

IN closing this discussion I know I speak for all my colleagues on the Editorial Board in thanking those who have taken part in it. But in my comment on that discussion I presume to speak only for myself.

No idealistic critic of the strike can believe more truly than I that it is entirely within the competence of men to establish a sort of a cooperative commonwealth in which there will be neither strikes nor justification for them. In establishing that commonwealth, the application of single-tax principles to land, the cooperative movement, "industrial democracy" (whenever it is sincere), and political action have large place. But most fundamental is industrial organization of the workers; and under present conditions industrial organization is rendered well-nigh impotent if labor foregoes the right to strike—a right which, to be sure, ought to be used wisely and with a high sense of responsibility.

Entirely as I agree with my colleague Dr. Holmes in his opposition to war, I cannot agree with him in his unqualified declaration that the modern strike represents a transformation "from an act of martyrdom to an act of war." Nor can I agree that his alternative methods, however valuable some of them may be in themselves, can be substituted for the strike. In particular, I am unable to share his faith either in the adequacy or the moral superiority of pure political action. It is psychologically impossible for labor to act effectively on the political field until it has learned unity in the industrial conflict. As an acute English observer and historian has written, "The most widely spread and deeply rooted association now-a-days is industrial, in the work shop." Hence organization must begin there and not at the ballot-box. Dr. Holmes speaks of what a labor party might accomplish in Pennsylvania. But general social conditions and in particular the capitalist control of the press make it inevitable that a strong labor party in Pennsylvania should have to wait on the organization of an intelligent labor union. The repeated election of a constructive radical like Jim Maurer to the presidency of the Pennsylvania A. F. of L. is the necessary forerunner of educational or political action. May the latter come soon! But not only, as it seems to me, does Dr. Holmes forget the truth that economic conditions necessarily determine to a large extent the scope and possible effectiveness of political action, but also he idealizes both the state and political action. His objection to the strike is its coercive power; but the modern state which labor is to seek to use for its own ends is essentially a police organization, and modern politics even when directed to high ends contain innumerable ethical perils. It is certain that the state would have to apply coercion to recalcitrant employers, for it is hardly likely that employers who now fight protracted battles in order to crush the workers would easily and peacefully acquiesce in decisions of pro-labor wage courts. Moreover, these courts themselves would almost certainly become clogged with work and paralyzed with bureaucracy to a degree that would menace systematic production even more than strikes do at present. As for Governor Allen's pet scheme of industrial

courts set up in a state where there is not even a strong labor party, not only are they not workable but they are not truly ethical. Voluntary agreement in favor of arbitration is one thing; compulsory arbitration is another. Courts may settle disputes between individuals because there is a generally accepted notion of justice lying behind the particular dispute, but who shall decide what are "just" terms on which a man shall work? What is a fair wage or a fair day's work? In great industries the right of the individual to quit work is usually the right to starve, and the prohibition of strikes by court action is therefore slave labor. Grant the priority of the public interest; it remains true that strikes by no means threaten that interest as seriously as does this new slavery. When the lawyers who now dominate industrial courts agree to leave the determination of their own working conditions to a court dominated, let us say, by coal miners, we shall have at least a fairer basis for discussion of the principles Governor Allen so persuasively advocates. Especially is it true that so long as the coal mines are run for private profit it is an absolute detriment to true public interest to permit the state through a labor court or an injunction to fix terms on which men shall work for the further profit of the few who have already possessed themselves of the wealth which is our common heritage.

If there is to be any compulsory labor it must at least be in industry not run for the profit of the few, in which labor collectively has practically supreme power and seeks to safeguard the rights of the individual workers. These are the conditions precedent to the Russian experiment in labor conscription. For my part, I believe that if this Russian experiment is continued beyond the present desperate emergency it will fail. Such conscription means the inevitable establishment of oppressive bureaucracy and an inevitable injury to personality. Unless socialism or communism can rapidly organize production on the basis of the intelligent co-operation of free men rather than any kind of conscription, it will lead to new revolutions. But for the same papers on the one hand to criticize the conscription of labor in Soviet Russia, and on the other to support military conscription and Governor Allen's industrial courts here in America is worse than absurd. Logically a far better case can be made for the former than the latter, and in practice labor armies are working in Russia while the Kansas court does not work and has merely increased the bitterness of labor.

The truth is that the problem of the strike is bound up with the much greater problem of the relation of the individual to the state, or rather to society. Its ultimate solution depends upon our learning to control machinery so that men will be its master and not its slaves. This is a spiritual problem even more truly than it is a problem of engineering efficiency or of rational economics. In

the meanwhile, I can only reiterate with all possible emphasis that I do not think that those of us who accept the advantages of the present system of large-scale machine production in industry, and the protection of the police state, or who enjoy any share whatever in profit, rent, or interest, have an ethical right to oppose the strike as a means for the emancipation of labor. We can, however, use any influence we may have with the employing class to avert the necessity of strikes, and with the workers to make the right to strike minister to a constructive and far-visioned program of social progress.

Pointing the Way to Freedom

CABINETS come and cabinets go; the non-enforceable Turkish treaty has not quieted French jealousy of British power or brought peace to the Near East; Hungary protests bitterly against the treaty of dismemberment forced upon her by the Allies, and Hungarian workmen appeal—not in vain—to their comrades throughout the world to establish a boycott against the Horthy regime of the Allies and the United States, until such time as it shall abolish the White Terror. Hunger and typhus lay waste Central Europe, but the Allies and the United States give aid and countenance to the mad Polish adventure into the Ukraine—an adventure doomed to defeat—and the League of Nations makes no protest. But from unexpected quarters comes news of the stirring of the masses. Not only is labor in various countries refusing to ship munitions, but black Senegalese troops, the main reliance of French imperialism, recently refused to embark for new wars against the Turkish nationalists in Syria. They preserved perfect order and obeyed every command except the one to embark. It may be that the white peoples of the new nations of Central Europe will learn equal wisdom, refuse to be tools of British or French imperial intrigue, discover that cultural differences do not oblige you to fight your next-door neighbor either with arms or tariffs, and make a beginning at reconstruction by getting together in a customs union.

ON Sunday, June 13th, in Carnegie Hall, New York, the Polish loan drive for \$50,000,000 was launched. Secretaries Colby and Baker sent their blessing. Mr. Colby talked piously of Polish industry, but Mr. Baker remembered his old phrases about Poland's being the "barrier of western civilization" against those terrible Russians. It is a very precarious barrier, despite the enormous stores of American munitions Mr. Baker so generously contributed to his marauding friends, whose claim on the Ukraine was precisely that of Germany's upon Belgium. If Americans subscribe to this Polish loan and others like them it may not be long before we will be urged to send armies to protect civilization, that is, investments, from the revolutionary wrath of the exploited people.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

The Old Dilemma

THE discussion of the thics of the strike raises and partially answers some haunting questions. But it is disconcerting to find some of the same statements made in support of the moral rightness of the strike that were so lately used by others against the war position of the writers.

How often we were assured that we must be "guided by the practical" and wary of forming moral judgments on the basis of the "absolute ideals of the Sermon on the Mount" (at any date earlier than the millennium)—that failure to fight with our friends was the equivalent of fighting for their and our enemies. These arguments are better used and better qualified in the latter than the former instance, hut—I wish they did not sound so bitterly familiar.

Is it not possible to defend the strike as capable of use as an instrument of good will to all concerned, including those who suffer from and are coerced by it? Is it "on a very different moral plane than war?" Dare we say that coercion is not evil in itself, though destined eventually to disappear from use? One hopes to find that this kind of defense is sound because we believe that love still fulfills the law.

Another disquieting question arises from war memories. Have we persistently focused attention on war at its worst (avoiding when possible the American Revolution), and are we now as persistently presenting the strike at its best rather than its worst—as "passive resistance" rather than "organized warfare?"

It is good for us to be reminded that we do in fact constantly compromise with a coercive system. But we are constantly on the search for that faint boundary line between voluntary and involuntary compromise. Some of us thought we found it recently somewhere between Liberty Bonds and three-cent postage stamps; others thought it lay between combatant and non-combatant service; still others would not step over it to avoid prison. We all thought it was somewhere and located it as best we could.

This discussion of the strike ought, at least, to help us to a charitable understanding of those who did not see our way out of the war dilemma. H. D. B.
Minneapolis, Minnesota.

In Support of Dr. Cadbury

I WAS greatly interested in reading the letters of Henry J. Cadbury and Norman Thomas on strikes. I must say that I am inclined to agree with the former in looking upon strikes as necessarily involving unethical ideals and as probably indicative of troubles capable of being dealt with in other ways.

Apparently Norman Thomas overlooks the fact that a strike is almost always primarily an acute symptom of a chronic disease of the industrial system, viz., the constant change of workers' names on the employers' payrolls—payroll turn-over, it is called.

Every change in these names should seem a danger flag to the employer, for a change always means that a new worker has to be trained to fit the employer's system of management, and often means the new

worker has to learn to use new machines, all at the employer's expense of time and breakage.

Moreover careful study by competent managers and others indicates that most of such changes today are due to faulty industrial management. It is therefore likely that a large payroll turn-over furnishes a simple, easily interpreted symptom of some industrial trouble likely to develop into the acute type or strike.

Publicity of payroll turn-overs could easily be made compulsory by law, thus calling to the attention of the managers the trouble that is brewing, as well as bringing to light the incidental item of expense which they now overlook. In my book *Industry, Emotion and Unrest* which Harcourt, Brace and Howe will shortly publish, I have suggested the outline of a comparatively simple law for making such publicity effective, and I may add that several large employers have said they would like to see such a law tried out. They believe such publicity of payroll turn-overs would profoundly modify the reputations of many industrial managers, and by giving publicity to the work of truly efficient managers would tend to lift the labor problem out of the mire.

I cannot help believing that constructive Christianity is properly concerned with analyzing problems and suggesting solutions along these or other lines, rather than in trying to justify strikes. It is true that it takes ethical principles to bind workers together in a strike; but I believe that the employers whose records creditably stand the publicity suggested above will be found to be those who make it possible for their workers to find in work-a-day life an approach to such solidarity of ethical ideals as the workers find otherwise only in a strike.

I do not condemn those true Christian leaders who have thrown in their lot with the workers, and so are called upon to be leaders in strikes, tempering the spirits of the violent, and cheering the down-hearted. My only concern is that the rest of us should try to be equally constructive, and not spend our energies seeking to justify what to so many seems primarily unethical.

EDWARD THOMAS.

Life not a "Living Hell" for Polish Jews, says Richard Evans

I HAVE been reading today your April issue and must take exception to the following sentence in "Pogroms and Zionism." It is perhaps only a small matter, but exaggerated phrases are the main support of racial hatreds. You say, "In Poland probably not over four hundred Jews have actually perished in pogroms, but life is made a living hell for them by economic and social discrimination; in a country where hunger is general the Jews fare worst."

I have been in Poland for the last nine months and I've not spent the time skimming the surface of life in Warsaw cafés or reading the papers, but my work has taken me into the homes of the people hourly and daily, and the phrase "a living hell" is certainly not a true indication of the relations of the Jews with the Poles, nor is the statement that "the Jews fare worst"

as regards food true. I do not wish to say that the Jews are as little oppressed as one might wish. They are subject to the contempt of minor officials on the railway and elsewhere—but who is exempt from that except the foreigner? They have to close their shops for certain hours on Sundays in addition to their own sabbath, and they are not allowed to enter the service of the Government. But these things don't make life a living hell, and the Jews we do business with seem generally quite cheerful. They are mostly commercial people and come in for a good deal of the abuse now common to the "prostitute." They are very dirty in their persons and houses, and if contempt would raise them to better standards of cleanliness I could wish for more contempt. The American Relief Administration gives out their food on a percentage basis—a method not exact when populations vary—with special food for the Jews, but probably it happens as it happened to us that the Soup Kitchen is bung up because some Jew landlord asks an exorbitant rent for his premises, or the Jewish charity organization is not strong enough to make things go. All is not well with the Jews, all is not well with the Poles, and there's a measurable approach to a "living hell" caused by "economic and social discrimination" for hundreds of people in England, Europe, and I suppose America, too, so that to use this sentence as you do is I think far from the truth.

RICHARD EVANS.

Poland, May 8th.

An Answer by Rabbi Magnes

I HAVE no doubt that everything that Mr. Evans says about Jewish profiteers is true. Jews, as others, have their full share of the profiteers.

All I can say in answer to his other statements is that literally every day the daily Jewish newspapers, of which there are four in New York City, contain telegrams and reports from special correspondents giving the names of persons and places and the dates and all other harrowing details that would bear out your statement that "life is made a living hell for the Jews by economic and social discrimination." Moreover, the representatives of the Jewish Relief Committees keep sending detailed and authenticated reports to the same effect. There are also several men whom you know, and who represent the Jewish labor movement of New York, who have been in Poland and whose statements substantiate your own.

For instance, the *Jewish Morning Journal* of this morning has the following despatch from its London correspondent, N. Lazarus, dated yesterday: "Latest reports from Lemberg show that a crowd of Polish soldiers and officers, upon leaving a theater, marched into the Jewish quarter and brutally beat Jews there. Among those who were beaten was the former soldier Edmund Wolf."

"In Blashki a fierce attack upon Jews was made at the railroad station. Among those seriously wounded were Chayim Solnick of Lodz, Lieb Basilkofsky of Velun, and Feivel Stackman and Katsberg of Blashki."

"In Vilna the Commandant has issued a strict order that the pogroms by soldiers should cease."

Poland seems to have taken the place of Russia in more than one respect. Among other things, it is showing its capacity for "taking in" foreigners. In the Czarist days, almost every American wrote of the situation of the Jews in Russia in somewhat the same

strain as Mr. Evans now does of the Jews of Poland. The blandishments of officials, added to the undoubted viciousness of some groups among the Jews (these are fortunately in the minority), seem to blind their eyes and dull their sensibilities. I would refer Mr. Evans to the headquarters of the Joint Distribution Committee in Warsaw (Place Gryzbowski 7) rather than to the American Relief Administration for information concerning the sufferings of the Jews of Poland.

What a pity it is that Mr. Evans' letter and my own answer have to be written in these days when all the peoples of Eastern Europe are being done to death by war and disease and famine and hatred.

New York, June 10th.

J. L. MAGNES.

Dr. Dole and Denunciation

I AM surprised and a good deal disturbed at finding myself in disagreement with Dr. C. F. Dole, for I had always thought of him as one with whom I could walk all the way. And remembering the stern, well-deserved rebuke he once dealt the now-deceased "Public" for its tolerance of military tyrannies, I am also puzzled at his present attitude regarding denunciation, as shown in *THE WORLD TOMORROW* (May number, p. 154). I certainly cannot agree with him that, because he employed "denunciation," "Jesus, on this side of His utterances, does on the whole contrive to give a good deal of aid to those who 'in His name' are always counseling violence."

To my mind the highest value of Jesus' teachings is in the emphasis they place on moral force as distinct from and superior to the mere material or physical. With this distinction kept clearly in mind, there is no danger that violent denunciation will degenerate into physical violence. That the churches, which profess to be guided by the teachings of Jesus, the conquering of material error by the understanding of Spirit and of spiritual power, should be found "counseling violence 'in His name'" is too strange and heart-breaking to dwell upon.

If Jesus did, as recorded by one (and, be it noticed, only one) of the disciples, on one (and only one) occasion, resort to physical force—if it is true that He did "make a scourge of small cords" and drove the money changers out of the temple, He thereby left us an example of the folly and uselessness of trying to cure wrong-doing by the use of carnal weapons; for they got right back into the temple and have been there ever since.

I would not claim that denunciation is always "the highest or wisest use of our spiritual intelligence," but I believe there are times in which it is. It is, of course, true that "violent language and violent temper are but a form of violence"; but it seems to me that except among those who are materialists, who ignore spiritual power and are already advocates of physical violence, there is no need, no danger, of this form of violence "lending itself with one degree more of emotion to blows, punishment, and war." And it also seems to me that Dr. Dole overlooks the fact that, whatever may be said of "blows," "punishment and war" do not originate in emotion. They are calculated in cold blood; then those who have, or think they have, something to gain by war, work on the emotions of those who must do the fighting. Dr. Dole notwithstanding, I still cannot feel it wrong or useless to denounce such creatures as enemies of mankind.

CELIA BALDWIN.

Ex Libris

The Gospel According to William Booth

The Life of General William Booth. By Harold Begbie. In 2 vols. (Macmillan).

WILLIAM BOOTH was a great man who found an appreciative biographer. Mr. Begbie inclines to be a bit too rhetorical and repetitious. Moreover, much of his moralizing is superficial and misleading. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that he has put us under real debt by his devoted effort to collect all possible material concerning an extraordinary man. And what an extraordinary man was William Booth! A youth apprenticed as a pawnbroker's clerk in the drabest sort of mid-Victorian industrial town, he became one of the most powerful religious forces of the nineteenth century and ended his life as the friend of princes, kings, and potentates. In the long span of his years he faced bitter poverty, persecution, and ridicule. But at his death it was said, "Humanity weeps for William Booth as a man weeps for his friend." Nor did he acquire this position at the sacrifice of his domestic affections. The love of this old Puritan for that remarkable comrade, his wife, is a tender and beautiful thing. He had a real affection, too, for his children; yet he was "General first and father afterward," and at his death was still alienated from three of his children who had once been officers under his command. Something of the eager, insistent spirit of the man shines out in Mr. Begbie's account of his last conversation with his son Bramwell.

"I want you to promise me that when my voice is silent and I am gone from you, you will use such influence as you may possess with the Army to do more for the Homeless of the World. The homeless men. Mind! I am not thinking of this country only, but of all the lands."

"Yes, General, I understand."

"The homeless women"—and, with deepening tones, "Ah, my boy, we don't know what it means to be without a home."

"Yes, General, I follow."

"The homeless children. Oh, the children! Bramwell, look after the homeless. . . . Promise me."

"When the promise had been given, something of the old whimsical humor appeared as he exclaimed, 'Mind! If you don't, I shall come back and haunt you!'"

Very likely he would, for General Booth's love for God and man made him anything but a quietist!

William Booth acted upon the conviction that every soldier was saved to serve. Men were rescued from sin in order to lend a hand to their brothers. The sound sense and compassion of this position were accompanied to the end of his life by a narrow, yes, a cruel orthodoxy. He believed that God might damn to an eternal hell those same men and women for whom his heart bled here on earth. But it must be remembered that while his religious experience was his own, he merely took over his creed from mid-Victorian evangelicalism, and believing it, preached "as a dying man to dying men" with a zeal his early teachers

never knew. And, it must be admitted, it has yet to be demonstrated that a more reasonable theology can inspire an equal success or devotion in lifting men out of the gutter.

General Booth's politics and economics were as conservative as his theology. His compassion for men and women and little children led him into a wide range of social service, but it never led him to any vision of the need for a radical readjustment in the society which damned more children than he could save.

There was a time when the Salvation Army was persecuted in England very much as radicals are persecuted in America today. The unconventional, even bizarre, character of the Army's methods, the natural hostility to innovations in religious custom, explains part of that persecution. More of it is to be explained by the opposition of the publicans and some persons whose vested interests were threatened. To the credit of both groups, they with their contemporaries in general came to applaud what once they had attacked.

Ultimately the Army became enormously popular with the rulers of the earth. There is always enough humanity in high places and in low to applaud an agency which proves that "a man may be down but he is never out" without raising any awkward questions about the sources and uses of riches and power. Even the scribes and the Pharisees would not have objected to the salvation of "publicans and harlots" if the carpenter-preacher had not said so many unsettling things to and about their own respectable selves. It was a sure instinct that speedily led society to welcome the Army as a prop for the status quo.

In a closing chapter Mr. Begbie attempts a dramatic comparison between Darwin and Booth to support the thesis that the war came because the world followed the former rather than the latter. He does not make his case. The war did not arise primarily out of the unscientific application of the biological doctrine of the survival of the fittest to the realm of sociology but out of the inevitable clash engendered by capitalist imperialism. And this lay without the understanding or range of interest of William Booth. There is no sign that he ever felt any special horror of war. Military organization was congenial to him. During the Boer War, to be sure, he expressed some sorrow that Salvationists might be fighting against Salvationists, but he never questioned British imperialism. It is related that he once prayed with Cecil Rhodes in the carriage of a railway train, but he never sought to turn him from his idolatry—the worship of empire. And were he alive today, he, like his successors in the Army, would be appealing for support on the basis of the war service of the Army. Yet the old General with his life-long insistence that the real—virtually the only—task of the Army was soul-saving might have been perturbed at the tremendous emphasis on the value of doughnuts. I once heard a soldier say to the applause of his comrades, "The Salvation Army folks are the real people. When I was in France they gave us hot doughnuts and didn't talk religion like some of those guys in the Y. M. C. A. buns." William Booth would not have liked that story. It made me wonder more

than a little what the future development of the Army was to be. Will it keep its essential religious value and yet modernize its theology? Will its autocratic control—so efficient when the autocrat was William Booth—fit the needs of a democratic age? Does its militaristic form unfit it to preach against the militarism of the empires of this world? Above all, will the followers of General Booth ever be able to apply their very real compassion for men to the mighty task of changing the system which keeps men slaves in body and soul? Mr. Begbie would say that these questions have led me far astray from his book. Perhaps that is so; but one cannot read this tale of a really great man without some thought for the religious and social problems involved in both the strength and the weakness of his unique creation—the Salvation Army.

N. T.

A Study in Irish Life

Maureen. By Patrick MacGill (Robert M. McBride & Co.)

ONE of those long novels in which the reader becomes wholly lost in the story and lives with it for days is MacGill's latest book. Becoming lost, he dwells in the Ireland of our time, in the little parish of Dungarrow, beyond the reach of railways, among poor and humble peasants. The story is woven from the lives of these people—a story as somber in color as the soil from which its characters gain a hard livelihood, but relieved by bits of Irish humor. The daily grind of these people's lives, the daily small tragedies and joys, the biting gossip of one about another and the social ostracism of the backslider from village ways, the harsh parsimony bred of poverty: these things are portrayed with intimate care and make up as it were the warp and woof of the tale.

But shot through it are threads of a stronger color. Maureen O'Malley, Columb Ruagh Keeran, Eamon na Sgaddan—these are the more brilliant threads, possibly including Cathal Cassidy, Maureen's lover, the fine young Sinn Féiner who is drawn with no little affection. Maureen, illegitimate child of Kathleen, is a typical Irish heroine, beautiful, poor, high-spirited, and exceedingly wistful in her tragic life, driven as she is almost to the end by those dominant forces of social condemnation and greed which play against her dreams. Eamon na Sgaddan is in modified form the Irish fool originally made familiar in *The Playboy*—a compound of conceits and pretensions and weaknesses and pride and a certain quality of the visionary. Bruised and confused by life, Eamon is slowly ground between the upper and nether millstones of his own weakness. Columb is, as it were, the arch-villain. Overdrawn if you will, his character is yet a fine conception. Overweening ambition, ruthless greed, volcanic passion long pent in by a life of harsh and unnatural suppression: the man is a personification of these forces. Eventually these forces, at last unleashed, smash Columb and Maureen and Cathal together in overwhelming catastrophe, the more unbearable in that it snatches from Maureen's very lips a cup of happiness she had long awaited and richly deserved. . . . The final chapters, revealing Columb at his illicit trade of whiskey-distilling alone in the hills at night, and later with Maureen in his hut, the man a mad thing torn and dis-

torted by the three forces battling within him, are harrowing and superb. I confess that the picture haunted me for several days after I had read it.

Not exactly cheerful reading; yet very powerful and finely done withal. I have not read Hardy for years; but Maureen made me think of Hardy. There is something of the same big background, and the same sweep of large, uncontrollable forces driving men and women on to inevitable tragedy. G.H.

"Herbs, and Other Country Messes"

Useful Wild Plants of the United States and Canada. By Charles Francis Saunders. (Robert M. McBride & Co.)

TREASURE-TROVE for the nature-lover and amateur botanist is *Useful Wild Plants*. After you have read it, several score of common growing things of field and wood have a new meaning to you. And you have attained also a new knowledge of no little conversational value. It is a fine thing to be able to say to your friends as you stroll along a country road: "See that plant? Well, the roots are nearly as good as potatoes. The Indians used to bake them in stone ovens. . . . And that—the leaves, you know, make excellent greens. . . . Those ferns—you cut the young shoots in spring and cook them like asparagus. . . . That Dogwood—the bark was used for dye in the old days. . . . There's a tree that produces something like coffee when you boil the berries. . . . Do you know how the Indians made bread out of bitter acorns? I'll tell you. . . ." And so you acquire merit among your acquaintances, who indeed marvel that one small head can carry all you know.

Seriously, Mr. Saunders has performed a real service by describing for the first time in popular form the practical uses and value of innumerable wild plants scattered all over the country. I intend to try a lot of his recipes, my helpmeet willing (we did try the ferns, and I confess they weren't quite as good as asparagus; but I am not yet discouraged). For these recipes Saunders has drawn liberally on Indian and pioneer lore, as well as on his own wide experience as an out-door man.

The book is clearly and entertainingly written and profusely illustrated, and there is a unique classified index that looks very useful. G. H.

Notes on Books

GILBERT MURRAY's beautifully written little book *Our Great War and the Great War of the Ancient Greeks* (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) might serve as a treatise on the text, "The only lesson history teaches is that men never learn anything from history"; but the reader will devoutly share Professor Murray's unexpressed hope that we moderns will not repeat the mistakes of the Greeks to the end of the cycle.

I should like to recommend three very readable books on Russia, all of them written by fair-minded observers whose experience made them favorable to the Soviet Government. They are, *Bolshevism at Work*, by W. T. Goode, *The Russian Republic*, by Colonel Malone, (both Harcourt, Brace & Howe), "*Barbarous*" *Soviet Russia*, by Isaac McBride (Thomas Seltzer). In my opinion Professor Goode's is the most valuable. N. T.

Films to F

THE motion picture industry, with its tremendous influence on the American mind is today threatened with complete absorption and control by moneyed interests and reactionary forces. Not content with usurpation of the press the predatory powers employ the insidious methods of yellow journalism in the film. Their autocratic dictation is becoming more and more evident in misrepresentations and attacks against the exponents of economic, social and political progress.



Labor and its allies have not so far availed themselves of the method by which this propaganda may be answered in kind. Truth is desecrated and economic and political slavery are enshrined---*unopposed*---in an unending series of films manufactured and distributed by corporations completely controlled by capitalists.

What are the enlightened men and women of America going to do about it?

One solution is at hand.

The Labor Film Service is organized essentially to cope with this problem. It has at command the plans and services of a group of qualified and far-sighted persons imbued with the ideal of motion pictures dedicated to the cause of Human Betterment. They will make films that FIGHT FOR LABOR.

t for Labor

NORMAN THOMAS, Editor of "The World Tomorrow," says: Just as truly as labor needs its own press, it needs film service. I believe you ought to rally to you strong support from labor circles and from those liberals who realize the seriousness of the present situation. I for one heartily endorse your idea and trust you will be able to make it wholly successful."

Dr. JUDAH L. MAGNES, renowned Liberal Leader: "Replying to your letter of May 21st, permit me to say that your idea of using motion pictures in the advancement of labor's interests appears to me to be a very sound one. Kindly accept my best wishes for the success of your venture."

SCOTT NEARING: "My attention has been called to the fact that the Labor Film Service is planning to supply the American Labor Movement with motion pictures. It is said that fifty million Americans attend movie shows each week. If that is so it is vitally important to have them watching films that speak the message of industrial self-government and economic freedom. I wish you every success."

The Labor Film Service is organized primarily to serve the supreme ideal of helping human progress through the effective utilization of the motion picture. But it can not be gained that some profits will accrue, which will take the form of regularly declared dividends or be turned back into the sinking fund, according to the decision of the shareholders.

ENDORSED BY THE CENTRAL FEDERATED UNION OF NEW YORK CITY
JOSEPH O. CANNON, Field Organizer

Labor Film Service, Inc.

31 Union Sq., New York

— Tear off coupon—Subscribe to-day. —

SUBSCRIPTION AGREEMENT

LABOR FILM SERVICE Inc.

Gentlemen:—

Date.....

I hereby subscribe for.....shares of the capital stock of the Labor Film Service, Inc., at the par value thereof, to wit: Ten dollars per share and deposit.....thereon.

Name City and State.....

Address Issue Certificate to.....

Films To Be Produced

(1) **INDUSTRIAL FILMS**: The work and growth of unions, organizations, leagues and institutions, they paying the cost of production.

(2) **ANIMATED LABOR REVIEW**: News reels, pictorials, travelogues and scenics depicting the worker's life in the mines, in the slums, on farms, railroads, the picket line, etc.

(3) **LECTURE LYCEUM**: Films, slides and textual data for labor forum lectures.

(4) **LABOR and RECONSTRUCTION SERIES**: Dramas, based on the writings of iconoclasts, to stimulate sociological, literary and artistic interest, thus laying the foundation for a great cultural work.

The innumerable labor and liberal forums are a market ready and waiting for these films. Afterward there are the 18,000 movie theatres. Films, unlike printed matter, are not at the mercy of post-office officials; regular circulation is assured.

Organization

The Labor Film Service, designed to make the movies a true forum of the people, is a corporation of New York State with an authorized capital of \$50,000 in shares of \$10 each. No majority stockholders will control, as all individual holdings are limited to \$1,000. The executive staff of expert workers will be governed by an advisory council of Labor and Liberal Leaders.

The Washington School of New York

An endowed non-sectarian private school, appealing particularly to parents who wish to select a school for their children where the highest educational ideals are not made impossible through lack of funds.

The school accepts only pupils of a high degree of mental ability; it studies carefully each one with a view to developing to the maximum his special aptitudes. This is done by giving to the pupils those experiences and enthusiasms which make them active agents in directing and controlling their own social activities. Furthermore, there is promoted a constantly increasing understanding and appreciation of our social, economic, and industrial life, its development and its problems for the future.

This is done to the end that our pupils may be prepared for participation and leadership in the world of to-morrow.

For detailed information write to

PHILIP W. COX, Headmaster,
17 East Sixtieth Street, New York City.

Mr. Cox will be at the school week days after August 15th for consultations and registration.

BROOKWOOD

"Education for Service in the New World"

A Community School for the training of those who wish to help in Christianizing the social order.

Courses in Religion, Sociology, History of Civilization, Languages, Art, Music, Science, Mathematics. Preparation for college if desired. Expert faculty. Laboratory plan of study.

Practical experience in cooperative farming, cooking, housekeeping, and community self-government. You learn by doing.

Democratic group of students of both sexes from varied environments, of high school and college age. No fixed charge for tuition.

Applications for membership in **BROOKWOOD** as teachers or students will be cordially received.

William M. Fincke
John Nevins Sayre
Spencer Miller, Jr.

Write to Brookwood,
Katonah,
New York.

Keep your religious thinking abreast of your other thinking

The Christian Century

A Journal of Religion

**CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON and
HERBERT L. WILLETT, Editors**

N THESE days of great thinking on world themes, constructive leaders must think greatly on Christian themes. A notable series of brilliant and candid articles by leading American thinkers, covering the entire range of typical present-day opinion from orthodox apologetic to radical criticism, is now appearing in The Christian Century, on the general subject—

"Will the Church Survive?"

The most significant journalistic offering in the history of the American religious press. Among the writers are:

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson	Dr. Shailer Mathews
Dr. Robert E. Speer	Dr. Harris Jenkins
Mr. John Spargo	Dr. Edward Scribner Ames
Dr. Joseph Ernest McAfee	Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Mr. Francis Hackett	Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie
The Hon. Louis F. Post	Mr. Max Eastman
Dr. Graham Taylor	Mr. Carl Sandburg
Prof. Harry F. Ward	Dr. H. D. C. Maclellan

The Subscription Price of The Christian Century is Three Dollars a Year. New subscribers note two special acquaintance offers in coupons below.

— Tear off and mail today —
Acquaintance Subscription
to Jan. 1, 1921, \$2.

The Christian Century,
1400 S. Wabash Ave.,
Chicago.

For the enclosed \$2 please send me The Christian Century, weekly, until Jan. 1, 1921, and a copy of "The Protestant," by Burris Jenkins.

Name

Address

.....

Five Months' Acquaintance Subscription, \$1.

The Christian Century,
1400 S. Wabash Ave.,
Chicago.

For the enclosed \$1 please send me The Christian Century for a trial period of 5 months (22 issues).

Name

Address

.....

THE CENTRALIA CONSPIRACY By RALPH CHAPLIN

Only the Lumber Trust version of the Centralia affair was permitted to reach the public. The newspapers said that unoffending paraders were killed without provocation or excuse by ambushed I. W. W.'s. Do you believe it?

This remarkable booklet contains an accurate and complete story of the whole affair. It reveals startling facts—suppressed facts—facts that you were never intended to hear. Read about the tremendous and bitter struggle of the Western lumberjacks against the Lumber Trust for better conditions.

For sale through

THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT

Price 50 cents

Send postcard for free copy of

Can A Christian Be A Soldier?
to A. Ritzl

1620 Ridgefield Street, Cleveland Heights, Ohio

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 8

AUGUST, 1920

15 Cents

The Implicit Religion of
Radicalism: Norman Thomas
Land of the Pilgrim's Pride:
Seymour Deming *✦ After the
Winnipeg Strike-What?: A.
Vernon Thomas *✦ The Appeal
for Leadership: Whitaker and
Coleman *✦ Dawning Light on
Russia: Albert Coyle *✦ The
Working People's Nonpartisan
League: Fred A. Harding *✦
America in Convention *✦ The
Search for a New Party

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the July Issue

	Page
Signs of the Times.....	227
The Implicit Religion of Radicalism—An Open Letter to One Who is Perplexed—By Norman Thomas.....	231
Land of the Pilgrim's Pride. By Seymour Deming.....	233
Americans in Convention.....	235
The Search for a New Party.....	237
The Appeal for Leadership. By Robert Whitaker and J. Covington Coleman.....	238
O Khip of State! By Viola C. White.....	240
After the Winnipeg Strike—What? By A. Vernon Thomas.....	241
The Working People's Non-partisan Political League. By Fred A. Harding.....	244
At the Station. Translated From the Russian.....	246
Pacificism in Russia. By Evelyn Sharp.....	248
Open for Discussion.....	249
Dawning Light on Russia. By Albert Coyle.....	252
The Last Column. By the Proof-reader.....	254

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

SEYMOUR DEMING is a journalist who has contributed to The Atlantic Monthly and other publications.
ROBERT WHITAKER and J. COVINGTON COLEMAN are clergymen of the Community Church, Los Gatos, California.
VIOLA C. WHITE will be remembered as the author of "The Litany of the Comfortable" and "Russia to the Allies" in previous issues.
A. VERNON THOMAS, formerly a resident of Canada, is associate editor of The Nautical Gazette.
FRED A. HARDING is editor of the Minnesota Leader.
EVELYN SHARP is on the staff of the English Manchester Guardian and Daily Herald.
ALBERT COYLE, a graduate of the Yale School of Religion, was formerly a Y. M. C. worker in Russia. He was taken prisoner by the Bolsheviks and had many opportunities to observe the working of the Soviet Government, which he learned to admire.

THE GOAL NEARLY WON

WE can report most encouraging progress in securing the funds necessary to assure the maintenance of THE WORLD TOMORROW throughout the year. If our friends who have not yet made any pledges will guarantee \$1,125, we can announce next month the completion of our indispensable Guarantee Fund. At the same time we must remind you that this fund is calculated at an absolute minimum; it leaves scant margin against unexpected expense and less to enable us to push the kind of vigorous circulation campaign which in time will lead to self-support. If, therefore, our Guarantee Fund can be over-subscribed it will be clear gain to the magazine and will help to put it on a firmer foundation. But no month at the disposal of the office can equal in value the zeal of our readers in sending in new subscriptions and the names of likely subscribers. It is by this sort of interest that we have become established; it is by its continuance that we shall grow in power, in usefulness, and ultimately, we trust, in ability to be self-supporting.

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 6% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Price of these books are subject to change by the publisher.

Our Great War and the Great War of the Ancient Greeks. Gilbert Murray (Thomas Seitzer).....	1.25
Bolshevism at Work. W. T. Goode (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
The Russian Republic. Colonel Malone (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
"Barbarians" Soviet Russia. Isaac McBride (Thomas Seitzer).....	2.50
The Unfinished Program of Democracy. Richard Roberts (R. W. Hoebech).....	2.50
What the Workers Want. Arthur Gleason (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	4.00
Facts and Fabrications About Russia. Evans Clark (Rand School, N. Y.).....	.50
The Central Conspiracy. Ralph Chaplin.....	.50
Useful Wild Plants. Charles Francis Sanders (McBride).....	2.00
Manure, Patrick MacGill (McBride).....	2.00
Life of General William Booth. Harold Begbie (Macmillan).....	10.50
New It Can Be Told. Philip Gibbs (Harper).....	2.00
The Judgment of Peace. A. Latzko (Bonl & Liveright).....	1.75
The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
The Bishop and Other Stories. Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
The Chorus Girl and Other Stories. Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
A Short History of the American Labor Movement. Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
New Ventures of Faith. Edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press). Boards.....	.90
National Ideals in the Old Testament. Henry Cadbury (Scribners).....	1.75
The Shadow. Mary White Ovington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00
Untimely Papers. Randolph Bourne (R. W. Hoebech).....	1.50
The Social Problem. Charles A. Eliwood (Macmillan).....	1.75
Man or the State. Edited by Waldo R. Brown (R. W. Hoebech).....	1.25
The New Social Order. Harry F. Ward (Macmillan).....	2.50
Our America. Waldo Frank (Bonl & Liveright).....	2.00
The Grail of Life. John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.).....	2.00
Fighting Without a War. Ralph Abernethy (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
Socialism in Thought and Action. Harry W. Laidler (Macmillan).....	2.50
The Brass Check. Upton Sinclair.....	.60

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. August, 1920. No. 8.

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
115 East 25th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevil Bayne, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gora Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Mallab, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union \$1.75. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at the Fellowship Press, 115 East 25th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1979.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 8

AUGUST, 1920

15 Cents

Signs of the Times

Tweedledum and Tweedledee

THE Gold Dust Twins are not more alike than Messrs. Cox and Harding. Since you cannot have both, let either do your work. Both were born on farms, both rose from poverty to comparative wealth, both became newspaper owners and editors and successful Ohio politicians. Either can run with perfect assurance that he is no superman but only "an average man" of the sort to whom Senator Harding says government should be entrusted. It is to the credit of both men that they have been comparatively immune from the red hysteria. Senator Harding promptly denounced the expulsion of the Socialist assemblymen in Albany and Governor Cox preserved to a considerable degree the right of free speech and assemblage in Ohio during the steel strike. Neither man has as yet come out as an apostle of universal military training and service. Neither Cox nor Harding was on the white list of the Anti-Saloon League, although the former was more avowedly the candidate of the wets. Governor Cox has a fair administrative record and is more favorably regarded by orthodox labor leaders than his opponent. But the New York *Commercial* declares, "Business will be safe with either man." Senator Harding was nominated by the Republican Old Guard, Governor Cox by the Murphy-Taggart-Brennan combination of Democratic bosses. It's Hobson's choice.

Sound and Fury, Signifying Nothing

THE platforms are almost as much alike as the candidates. This year, if ever, they ought to mean something, but as usual they seem written to be forgotten. Save for the League of Nations plank there is not a pennyworth of difference between the Republican and Democratic documents. The Republicans say, "Turn the Democratic rascals out." The Democrats rejoin, "Keep the Republican rascals out. The Democratic platform is slightly more liberal-sounding and goes to great length in favoring centralized government against the old Democratic doctrine of State's Rights. But neither in it nor in the Republican platform is there any comfort for the liberal on such vital matters as industrial affairs, intervention in Mexico, the re-

storage of civil liberties, and the establishment of a righteous foreign policy. It is the old story. So far as the two parties are concerned, the campaign with all its sound and fury will be nothing but a stage battle put on for the delectation of the people and to distract their minds from vital things. Whichever party wins, government of the people by Privilege and for Privilege will not perish from the earth.

The Old Parties and Our Foreign Policy

IT is not even clear that the difference on the League of Nations plank will be developed in a clear-cut fashion by Messrs. Cox and Harding. At any rate, the issue is unreal. It makes little appeal to the proverbial "man in the street." As regards the large issues of world reorganization the League is admittedly powerless. Its place has been usurped by the Allied Council. Even if it were brought to life, so long as the imperialist temper prevails the League would only be a bungling instrument for fostering and perhaps adjusting the selfish ambitions of the Allied governments. A really liberal American foreign policy would demand the immediate rectification of the enormous injustices of the Treaty of Versailles as an indispensable condition to a true League. But this neither party so much as suggests.

Abating the Terms of Peace

THE Spa Conference came to its end with a host of questions still unsettled. Neither the German nor the Allied ministers acted like physicians who knew how to bind up the wounds of Europe. Allied unity was formally preserved, but the conflict between the British and French viewpoints was evident. On the whole, Lloyd George won. Germany gained an extension of time in which to disarm. It is profoundly to be hoped that her disarmament will be real and will be accompanied by similar action on the part of her conquerors. The agreement about coal is another matter. Whether Germany can deliver 2,000,000 tons a month will depend largely on what the miners do, not what the diplomats say. But if the conference left much to be desired, it nevertheless marked pro-

gress. Even the French officials have come to see that a starved Germany means a hungry Europe. As a matter of practical necessity Germany has been admitted to the conference table and the Carthaginian Peace of Versailles has been substantially modified. Yet we are still being told it is our sacred duty to ratify without protest that unenforceable product of vengeance, greed, and fear.

Russia Forces England's Hand

INCALCULABLE consequences hang on the result of two interdependent developments in Russian affairs: the Lloyd George-Krassin trade negotiations and the progress of military events on the Polish border. It seems now that peace is in sight. The Soviet offers the Poles better terms than the Allies if they will negotiate directly instead of through Great Britain. After the terrible events of the last few years the advantage rests not with the Allies but with Russia, victorious over all her foes. The obviously inspired Washington despatch to the New York Times under date of July 17th speaks of the change of "the whole balance of power in Eastern Europe" and the "defensive attitude of the Western Powers." This it admits is due to "irresponsible imperialism" of the sort that encouraged the last mad Polish adventure whose crushing defeat leaves Poland a suppliant for mercy. The despatch makes further candid admissions. Lloyd George's desire for peace and trade is based not merely or chiefly on the Russian victory over the Poles or the necessity of Russian participation in economic reconstruction but on the progress of Soviet power and influence in the Near East and India. It may be added that the Irish independence movement gains in strength and that British Labor threatens direct action against the military occupation of Ireland. No wonder Lloyd George wants an understanding with Lenin.

Tortuous Ways of the State Department

AS for Poland, or at least the Polish people, they have a rightful claim to pity. Their imperialists put them into an impossible adventure at the behest of France with the support of the English war minister Winston Churchill. Munitions and war materials were generously furnished by England, France, and the United States. If by some miracle the Poles had won they would have been acclaimed as saviors of civilization. They lost, and Lloyd George coolly tells them he never approved of their campaign and bids them sue for peace. Our most anti-Bolshevik papers mournfully agree that the Poles were ill advised, and semi-official despatches such those to which we have referred imply that our State Department steadily disapproved of the campaign which our War Department aided!

That same State Department has at last partially lifted the embargo on trade with Russia. But it still excludes locomotives, which are Russia's

greatest need, because they could be used for war purposes; it offers no protection to American merchants; and it establishes no postal relations. Avowedly it seeks no real trade but only to deprive Russian sympathizers of one claim to popular hearing by nominally lifting the blockade. It still inspires newspaper stories that the downfall of the Bolsheviks is near, this time not because of their impending defeats but because their victories have roused Russian nationalism, the inevitable foe of Bolshevik internationalism. Bolshevik atrocity stories die hard in the newspapers. The New York Times revived one utterly discredited tale by publishing pictures of Russian girls who it alleges had fled to escape nationalization. Nevertheless, the change in tone is marked. After months of unnecessary bloodshed and suffering it looks as if the United States, like the European powers, would be driven to deal with the Soviet government. What tragedies might have been spared if our government had listened to Raymond Robbins in 1918!

Wounded In the House of Their Friends

JUST at a moment when the controversy concerning the Interchurch World Movement and the appearance of its report and William Z. Foster's notable book *The History of the Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons* are drawing new and favorable attention to the cause of the steel workers, that cause receives a fearful blow not directly at the hands of the steel trust but from a labor union. The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, which is a craft union affiliated with the A. F. of L. composed almost exclusively of skilled workers, has definitely withdrawn from the National Committee for organizing all the iron and steel workers. This committee represented twenty-odd craft unions interested in the steel industry, but so great is the numerical and financial strength of the Amalgamated that its defection has brought the Committee to an end. Unless the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. can find a way to go on, organization of the steel workers is indefinitely postponed. The principle of united action by federated craft unions from which Mr. Foster and other labor leaders and students of the labor movement expected so much has come to naught. The basic steel industry will remain unorganized and at the mercy of the bosses. The facts so far revealed are these: the Amalgamated Association took part in the great strike; it gained in members and in financial strength; its officers now pull out of federated action on the ground that the methods of the committee might imperil the contracts the Association has, not with the Steel Corporation, but with a few independent steel companies. They assume before the public the pious rôle of defenders of the sanctity of contracts. But what shall be said of a system of contracts which deliberately makes a union of skilled workers scab on the unskilled? What of the selfishness of that kind of craft

unionism? Why did the Amalgamated accept the gains from the last strike if the methods of the Organizing Committee were wrong? Why did its officers refuse a hearing to members of the Committee when they granted it to the officers of one of the steel companies? Is this blow at the hopes of the mass of the steel workers the work of the rank and file of the Amalgamated Association or only of certain officers who have enormous powers under the union constitution? What, if any, hidden and sinister influences prompted an act more hostile to working-class solidarity than any open opposition of the mill owners? These questions go to the heart of craft unionism in America. If the Amalgamated Association of Iron Workers is in any degree typical of the constituent unions of the A. F. of L., the hope for progress through craft unions analogous to the progress of labor in England is very dim. A new form of industrial organization inspired by a finer philosophy of brotherhood must arise.

How Shall We Secure Real Education?

THE resignation of Principal Wolfson and the failure of the Board of Education of New York to reelect Associate Superintendent Tildsley have raised some questions of more than local importance. Dr. Tildsley, his successor, and the Board of Education, whatever their political or personal differences, have all endorsed the doctrine that the primary function of the public schools is not to train pupils to think clearly and to act according to conscience, but rather to inculcate an unquestioning loyalty to the political State. City Superintendent Ettinger rebuked Mr. Wolfson for allowing high school students to vote in a straw ballot for "a convicted felon" (Eugene V. Debs) and for permitting them to read the Social-list paper, *The Call*. He goes on to say, "If he [Professor Wolfson] thought that there was no necessity for advocating 'making peace in Berlin,' or if he could not without mental reservation, and in a free-moving, generous spirit, respond to the slogan of 'one hundred per cent. Americanism,' I am absolutely convinced that, despite his scholarship, his energy, or his technical skill, his innermost convictions, of which his utterances are the deliberate expression, absolutely disqualify him to hold the high office which made him the spiritual leader of thousands of young men standing expectantly on the threshold of citizenship." To ponder the full implications of this well-nigh incredible opinion of the Superintendent of the schools in our largest city is to realize how far we are from solving the all-important educational problem by state schools. Yet in Michigan there is a strong movement temporarily halted by an adverse legal opinion to secure a Constitutional amendment abolishing all private schools and compelling attendance at the public schools. We have no particular love for the parochial schools at which this amendment is

aimed, but it is a dangerous intolerance which could compel all children to be taught the worship of the State in schools controlled by the political representatives of Privilege. There is no more important question before us than this: How shall we get universal education without making the schools propaganda agencies of the dominant political and economic groups to a degree which will stifle thought, prevent the proper development of the individual, and hinder social progress? The question is made acute by such stupid inquisitions as we have had in New York; it would by no means be automatically solved under a socialist regime. Our readers showed much interest in discussing the ethics of the strike. Here is a more difficult and equally fundamental question for their consideration. We invite discussion.

The Food Outlook Improves

ACCORDING to the *New York Times* the crop outlook is much better than it was and we are in no danger of an immediate food shortage. The weather has been unusually favorable for growth. The *Times* professes to believe that the railroad tangle and shortage of cars will be straightened out and money found to move the crops. It is especially jubilant that there is now an abundance of labor. It quotes despatches from Oklahoma and Kansas City showing that the labor situation has changed. It the wheat belt in Oklahoma there are "three men for every job in the harvest field." This, says the *Times*, is a "pleasant surprise," although it goes on to add that it does not rejoice in the idleness of "willing hands." We, too, are willing to rejoice if the food outlook is more favorable, but we cannot say that we are particularly cheered by the reappearance of that labor surplus which means unemployment or only occasional employment for "willing hands," who are in reality not "hands" but human beings.

"Excessive Urbanization"

THE agricultural situation in the United States is far from satisfactory. Thoughtful writers are quoting the Italian historian Ferrero's famous statement that the Roman Empire fell because of "excessive urbanization" and that our modern civilization here in America faces a like fate. Instead of rejoicing with the local Boosters' Clubs over the great increase in population in various cities, these students are looking forward with some apprehension to see what the census will reveal about the country. Tenant farming, we know, is increasing with alarming rapidity. In the comparatively new state of Oklahoma, over forty per cent. of the farms are tilled by tenants. The social consequences are little short of disastrous. Nevertheless, we are in a much better position than the ancients to guard against "excessive urbanization." Agricultural machinery can be made to lighten the monotonous toil of the man with the hoe. Books,

magazines, the telephone, circulating libraries, Ford cars, all those ought to relieve the loneliness of the farm. The application of modern science to agriculture has lifted it to the dignity of a skilled profession. Broadly speaking, the solution of the agrarian problem would seem to lie along these general lines: (1) Education in the largest sense of the term and the enrichment of country life. Already schools, churches, and farmers' organizations are tackling this problem. (2) Social control of the process of distribution in the interest of both producers and consumers. This means the encouragement of cooperation, the elimination of middlemen, and social control of transportation, credit, and the like. It is this job the Nonpartisan League has tackled. On these matters the interests of farmer and laborer are one. But beyond them lies the even more fundamental problem of land ownership and the right of any individual to receive rent from land. Sooner or later we shall have to face the moral and economic questions raised by a system which gives a comparatively few landowners in city and in country the right to take enormous toll from the many by virtue of their title deeds. It is on this last point that the laborer, agricultural and industrial, may part company with the land-owning farmer. The European solution has been the division of the great pre-war estates among working peasants. But small holdings make the use of machinery difficult. The American expert, Professor Alonzo Taylor, says the consequence will be decreased production of cereals. It looks as if the way out would ultimately have to be the cooperative cultivation of large tracts, and that runs counter to the present instinct for private ownership of land. But meanwhile much can be done by the state's appropriation of the rental value of land through taxation.

Production and the Profit Motive

HERE is the story of the American Woolen Company. Last year it made more than one hundred per cent. profit. That same year it fought a sixteen-weeks strike in Lawrence, Massachusetts, on the ground that it could not afford to reduce hours without also cutting wages! It escaped indictment for profiteering under the Lever Act on the purely technical ground that the law applied only to clothing and that cloth is not clothing. This same company has now closed down some of its mills and is operating others on part time. Everybody knows that the world has not enough woolen cloth and that there is no such thing as overproduction in the absolute sense. But there is overproduction from the standpoint of profit, and the present system is necessarily run by the profit motive. Nevertheless, in face of the fact that capital immediately curtails production for its own purposes, the newspapers still preach to labor that the cure for the ever mounting cost of living is increased production.

Capital Consolidates Its Victories

THERE is small doubt that great employing interests are taking advantage of the comparatively dull times following the war boom to consolidate their victory over labor. Financial interests are preaching openly that the cost of living cannot fall until wages fall. In certain industrial towns like Paterson, N. J., individual bosses are taking advantage of the desperate need of the workers both to cut wages and to smash standards in the industry. The so-called open shop movement is widespread and is diligently preached by the newspapers as an expression of true Americanism. In some cases banks refuse credits to unionized industries. Despite the denials of representatives of great interests, it is hard to believe that they are not financing this anti-union movement on a national scale. It is cleverly argued that the open shop movement stands for industrial liberty. Nothing in reality is farther from the truth. The open shop movement means a shop closed against union labor. Even although unionists may be allowed jobs, the employers will not recognize collective bargaining, without which the union is of little use. The hope of orderly progress depends upon the growth of power of workers through their own organizations intelligently to control the conditions of labor and ultimately industry itself.

Giving the Children A Chance

SOME of the most encouraging events in American life get little notice. That is why the praises of the Kentucky legislature ought to be sung. In social matters it has just made a record of admirable progress. Among other things, it provided for a commission on a Children's Code, increased the budget of the State Board of Health from \$75,000 to \$135,000, raised all teachers' salaries to a minimum of \$75 a month (some had been under \$35), wrote a new and fairly adequate compulsory attendance law, and strengthened the child labor law. And it raised tax rates to provide the funds. All this was cheerfully done as a result of an elaborate investigation into child welfare in Kentucky made at the request of the state authorities by the National Child Labor Committee. Its report is a classic. It reveals some very sobering facts concerning the backward condition of many rural communities. Dr. J. Mace Andress has written that "contrary to tradition and popular belief, country children have been found to be as defective physically and in many cases more defective than city children." The records of the Child Labor Committee's investigations in other states bear out this statement. The fine thing is the prompt response of public opinion to the facts. We know no more valuable work than the Child Labor Committee is doing for the Nation's children both in town and country. Emphatically it deserves support.

The Implicit Religion of Radicalism

An Open Letter to One Who is Perplexed

DEAR PAUL:

So you have heard my friend A. D. argue that "every man is moved solely by self-interest;" that "the true socialist appeal is to the stomach of the man who hasn't got enough to eat;" and finally, that radical movements have "no need, no time, and no business to bother with anything but economics and the practical organization of the class struggle." And "worst of all," you add, "much as I disliked his argument, I couldn't answer him."

I confess I'm a bit surprised. Your "stomach philosopher" follows no scientific doctrine of economic determinism but that miserable perversion of it which Nicholas Murray Butler erects only to demolish for the edification of well fed Chambers of Commerce. Karl Marx never argued that a man was necessarily controlled by his desire for wealth. On the contrary, his whole life was a living proof that the bitterest poverty need not swerve a man from devotion to his cause. Surely it is now too late in the day for me to have to repeat to you the proof that the doctrine that "the relations of men to one another in the matter of making a living are the main underlying causes of men's habits of thought and feeling, their motives of right, propriety, and legality, their institutions of society and government, their wars and revolutions"—which is economic determinism—is not necessarily inconsistent with idealism or with theism. It is often those clergymen and editors who do not understand the doctrine who by the self-interest which guides their own actions illustrate the theory in its least attractive form.

What I am minded to inflict upon you is not an argument on economic determinism, which you can read any day in such books as Morris Hillquit's debate with Father Ryan or Harry Laidler's *Socialism in Thought and Action*, but a pet theory of my own; namely, that the religion of the future—or, if you like, the idealism of the future—is going to be built on elements already implicit in the radical labor movement. It is a pity that a natural reaction against the sentimentalism, not to say hypocrisy, of much of the endless talk in the churches about a brotherhood non-existent in the market-place has made radicalism afraid to express its own idealism—and even inclined to deny any validity to ethics. What is it that radicals, not excepting your belligerent materialist, really believe? Isn't it this: that men, the same kind of men we now know, are capable of an equitable collective control of natural resources and the means of production under conditions which will make for the emancipation of human beings and the at-

tainment not merely of new levels of material comfort but of happiness and creative power? I confess I am sometimes startled by the high order of faith behind that belief. What is there actually in humanity as we know it to make us scientifically sure of its power to carry on the business of living intelligently and cooperatively? What is there in that "tragedy men call history" or in our observation of ourselves and our neighbors to make us think we can surmount our pettiness, our mutual suspicions, our egoisms, our combativeness, sufficiently to cooperate in the difficult business of the efficient social control of our common life? May not H. L. Mencken be on just as "scientific" ground in his scorn of the common man, "homo boobus," as socialists in their trust in him? Personally, I reject Mr. Mencken's conclusions. I believe that despite man's faults and foibles, his susceptibility to unreasoning mob psychology, his struggle with his fear and hate and greed, he is capable of both freedom and fellowship. This faith is not contrary to experience; it builds upon the goodness and the wisdom we actually find in men; but I have to admit that it transcends experience and that to believe in the inevitable achievement of a desirable cooperative commonwealth by the working of economic forces is not scientific in the same sense as to believe in the sure working out of a geometric problem or a chemical formula in the laboratory. Do you wonder, then, that I find as a matter of plain everyday experience that my brand of socialism, and I suspect yours and every man's, requires as much faith as any religion under the sun? And I don't mean merely faith in the attainment of a cooperative commonwealth or a classless society or world-wide brotherhood—call your social goal what you will—but in the *worth-whileness* of that new society after it is attained. No true radical can be a cynic or a complete sceptic as to the value of personality. Life is more than meat and drink; all is not vanity. "Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die," was not written for him. Even when he proclaims most loudly that what he wants is food and clothing for all men, down in his heart he knows that he wants them because he thinks well fed men capable of a quality of life quite superior to that of well fed pigs. Did you ever think of the enormous significance idealistically of what is happening in Russia? Here are your communists half starved, fighting for the life of the Revolution, who still find time to turn lovingly and hopefully to education and art for the people as the justification of their sacrifices and hopes. The faith of the radical is a faith that men have in them some-

thing of the creative instinct which now lies crushed under the burden of a veritable slavery. His hope is that given emancipation from a false system the nobler aspirations of mankind may come to fine flower and abundant fruit not in terms of abstractions but of true and abiding human values—music, art, and fellowship.

But the radical's religion calls for more than faith and hope. It requires a love which is quite unsentimental and wholly courageous. It asserts that comradeship is now a present fact and that for its more perfect realization on earth it is worth while for the individual to sacrifice and endure. The radical is, to be sure, justly critical of any glorification of sacrifice for sacrifice's sake. He seeks to buy no future merit by present denial, but at his best, like all true men in all ages, he finds his own self-fulfilment in devotion to a cause greater than himself.

I remember that when we last discussed these things you were bitterly critical of the tendency in radical circles to talk as if the "dear love of comrades" could be realized as the normal motive of the new social order by men filled with a raucous hate not only of the capitalists but of all workers who reject or alter by so much as one jot or tittle their particular shibboleths. I acknowledge your criticism to be partially just. It is a tragic fallacy based perhaps on ignorance of the most fundamental traits of human nature to think that the commonwealth of good-will can be established by hate. The desire to abolish a privileged class in reality rests on love for individuals, including the individuals of that class, who also are enslaved by a system which sets so deep a gulf between members of the human family. It is an equally tragical fallacy which leads some radicals to say: "Since there is no good but the good of the working class, all talk of fair play is a device of the oppressor. It is right to do what serves our cause." Rather it is true that there is no good for the working class which leaves fairness out of account. Victories won by the prostitution of truth and ordinary fair dealing between man and man are in reality the worst of defeats. The cooperative commonwealth, if it is to endure, will require in the highest degree mutual tolerance, good-will, confidence in the honor of one's fellow men. To say that our hopes can be attained by the same unscrupulousness, the same appeal to hate, the same disregard of truth, the same contempt for personality as prevail in nationalistic war is to show pitiable ignorance of every lesson of history. It is a cheap cynicism or a quite unphilosophical pragmatism which leads some radicals to these errors in contempt of the logic of their own position. The true victory in the class struggle requires more than the defeat of those who now hold the power; it requires a victory of the exploited inspired by motives and won by methods that will not leave them powerless to build securely the city of their dreams.

You will see that what I am trying to say is this: the logic of a victorious radicalism requires it to be in the best sense religious. Its triumph depends upon its ability to make explicit its own implicit faith and hope and love. We learned in the crash of the war what we ought to have learned sooner; namely, that there was nothing less scientific than the nineteenth-century belief in an inevitable progress due to human evolution or the working of material forces. Alas, it is not so. Stated simply in terms of pure science, the terrible and brilliant pessimism of Henry Adams' *Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* is nearer the truth. It cannot be completely answered save as men turn to an idealistic rather than a materialistic philosophy. It is this fact that the radical must face. In his disgust at the unreality, the hypocrisy, or the cruelty of what has too often passed for religion, he may reject all the existing creeds. In the ardor of the struggle for the better world which shall not be "in the sky, by and by," he may for the time being forget the inescapable problems of "time and fate and death." These things a rather prominent woman told me the other day would not bother any radical with "a job, a good digestion, and a clean conscience." I do not despise any of her three defenses against the necessity for philosophic inquiry into the ultimate meaning of life. I merely doubt their adequacy. Sooner or later thoughtful men must face the problem no generation has escaped. What is it all worth? We are actors on a stage set with beauty and with grandeur. But as the years roll on, the stage will wax old, its beauty will fade, at the last it will disappear in fervent heat or turn cold as the mountains of the moon. Gone will be all the actors, leaving behind no record of their triumphs or their griefs. All progress ends at last in cosmic catastrophe. Nor can we dismiss this fate merely by saying that it is ages away. Each man of us now knows the frustration of his hopes and aspirations, feels somehow the great ironies of life and death. How will we meet them? Bertrand Russell has given one answer:

"The slave is doomed to worship Time and Fate and Death, because they are greater than anything he finds in himself, and because all his thoughts are of things which they devour. But, great as they are, to think of them greatly, to feel their passionless splendor, is greater still. And such thoughts make us free men; we no longer bow before the inevitable in Oriental subjection, but we absorb it, and make it a part of ourselves. To abandon the struggle for private happiness, to expel all eagerness of temporary desire, to burn with passion for eternal things—this is emancipation, and this is the free man's worship.

"United with his fellow-men by the strongest of all ties, the tie of a common doom, the free man finds that a new vision is with him always, shedding over every daily task the light of love. The life of Man is a long march through the night. . . .

One by one, as they march, our comrades vanish from our sight, seized by the silent orders of omnipotent Death. Very brief is the time in which we can help them, in which their happiness or misery is decided. Be it ours to shed sunshine on their path, to lighten their sorrows by the balm of sympathy, to give them the pure joy of a never tiring affection, to strengthen failing courage, to instill faith in hours of despair."

There is another answer: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him." It is not a common doom but a common destiny that binds men together—not death but life will win immortal victory.

I confess my own allegiance to the latter rather

than the former creed. For the moment, however, I am not concerned to argue these two answers to the meaning of life, but merely to point out that Mr. Russell's answer with all its pessimism as to ultimate things is truly religious. It is the free man's worship which gives him courage to go on. There is, in other words, no escaping the necessity for religion to give strength for life. Essentially the hope of radicals of every shade is religious. It cannot be sustained by a crassly materialistic philosophy. Out of radicalism, if it is to triumph, must come a new religious revival, different mayhap from anything we have known, but for that very reason more and not less real.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

Land of the Pilgrims' Pride

By SEYMOUR DEMING

"The breaking waves dashed high

"On a stern and rock-bound coast:

"The winds against a stormy sky

"Their giant branches tossed."

THEY did. The Sunday morning train out of Boston plunged through the March downpour past thundering sea beaches and the snug port villages of the South Shore. Drenched woods, drowned meadows, glimpses of sea through slanting lines of gray rain driven along on a furious Easterly gale.

Out of car windows on either side were the black pine forests, the bleak, March-brown fields wanting only the folk in bell-crowned hats or kirtles and hoods, Bible under arm or musket on shoulder, going to church, to repeople it with the politico-religious refugees of 1620.

The Plymouth of today is a seventeenth-century New England port town slowly smothering in a belated nineteenth-century factory growth. On the train one is aware that Plymouth is near by one of those squalid wooden tenement districts which proclaim the proximity of mill chimneys as inevitably as slave quarters proclaim the Southern manor. In the town, delicate colonial architecture is elbowed by jerry-built stores and garages; historic monuments of gray granite are jostled by the screeching vulgarity of billboards and stucco moving-picture palaces.

Out on a knoll south of the town, amid open rolling downs, stands a mausoleum of gray concrete: the jail. A low dome over its central mass under which is a wide hall, two stories high, galleried, with walls bare, white, and resounding to voice

and tread. Everywhere iron railings or iron bars, black against the bone-white walls. Men in gray trousers and shirts shuffle to and fro, meeting one's glance with shamed aversion or stare of indifference.

Four benches are placed back to the wall. An arm-chair faces each bench. The bench is for visitors, the chair for the prisoner. Two wardens sit where they can watch all four groups. Both wear looks of patient, perpetual boredom.

The stout warden waddles to a wicket and shouts:

"John Ballam!"

John Ballam steps briskly out of the corridor, his neat alertness of body showing even under the shapeless uniform of prison gray. Even here, as always with him, there is a kind of electric sparkle in his face, and in his whole aspect. Young though he is, his hair is a trifle threaded with gray. He radiates energy and intelligence.

Mingled with his welcome is a tinge of irony toward his jailers.

"I suppose there is a dictograph under the bench," opines the outsider.

"Say what you please," replies the insider, "I make no bones about what I am."

"First, how are you?"

"Sound as a nut. The food is poor and upsets one's stomach, but I have got around that to some extent by studying Horace Fletcher's method. By proper mastication I have only to eat one-third of my portion. . . . It's the same as keeping a horse in a stall: he goes soft and takes on flesh."

"How about inside: are you contented?"

"Being in jail is not so bad. If it weren't for my wife and kid I wouldn't mind staying here till

the working class stormed this and the other Bastilles. I have been through an algebra to keep an edge on my mind and have learned to read He-brew."

"How much leisure have you?"

"Only Saturday afternoons and Sundays. In winter, of course, you can do nothing for lack of light in your cell."

"See here, John, of course I know it was your speech at the Dudley Street Opera House in which you said it was a capitalistic war, and that it was under the Espionage Act, but what was it really got you your year in here?"

"There were a lot of legal twists and turns, of course, but as nearly as I can make out, the thing they finally 'got' me on was my saying that the human conscience stands above all law."

"Well, how are you satisfied with the way things are going—outside?"

He sat and sparkled:

"I don't see how they could be better." He spoke of the European situation, about which he was much better informed and more lucid than most of the people one encountered outside; and of the peaceable general strike in Seattle. "Do you remember our talk about violence last Spring?"

"Every word of it."

"Violence is a sign of weakness, of fear. Only the weak man is afraid. Workers are naturally peaceable: all they want is to be left alone. That is why Christianity made such headway always with the lower classes. It was a religion of peace."

"Then how do you account for all this talk about the I. W. W. advocating violence?"

"The capitalist press, to begin with: and then it is a class trait, just as it is a human trait, to attribute to those you dislike the vices peculiar to yourself. Capitalism maintains itself by violence because it is a rule of the few over the many: an unstable equilibrium on an insecure base. It has to be supported by artificial—violent means. . . . And how futile that violence is! They shut me in here and I make converts to socialism faster than I did outside. Discharged prisoners keep writing to ask me where is the nearest Socialist local they can join. . . . For my part, I want to express myself, and the capitalist system won't let me. I am at heart an artist, and under this system I can't have freedom. They won't dare let me express myself, for the truth is fatal to their power. They suppress me and make me their enemy. And so the very act of self-protection works to their disadvantage in the end. . . . The reason people are so discontented is that this system doesn't permit them to be artists—to express themselves. And everybody is an artist, in the sense of having this creative instinct."

"Oughtn't the tactics of the I. W. W. to be non-resistance?"

"Decidedly yes," said he, "and, what is more (capitalist press or no capitalist press), their tactics are nonresistance. By that I do not mean absence

of resistance, but resistance by something more than violence: 'passive resistance.' I find the I. W. W. instinctively passive resisters. Out West, during those fierce struggles for free speech in Fresno, the authorities used to say to us: 'Why, you "turn the other cheek!"' It was true. We did. I have seen a big lumberjack seized by a policeman for making a speech on the street and bashed against an iron telephone pole so that it cracked his skull, yet there was no resistance; and those big husky comrades of his standing by never interposed to beat up the policeman. They seemed to sense instinctively that in the game of violence the capitalist class could beat them: that they must find some other weapon.

"I myself have talked of 'force'; but I have meant something very different from a policeman's club. Force is life. Creative energy. The working class has it. We produce great ideas, songs, poetry, an art, a literature, all quite spontaneously."

"Don't you think, once in control, the working class can afford to be above taking vengeance on its enemies?"

"Yes: and I believe it will be. It is only a class that wreaks vengeance. A people does not. And the working class is not so much a class as a people. Revenge is the mark of a small mind. You find that view running through the best poets and thinkers. Put a creative mind in jail and see what happens: Gallileo, with a stick and a straw, proves that a hollow column will support a heavier load than a solid column; Bunyan writes the finest allegory in the English language. They have no time to brood over how badly they have been treated by their fellow men. Their creative force snatches them up and urges them on. So I do not think a victorious working class would have time or inclination for vengeance. The working classes are like children: they forget injuries. Besides, the creative force in man, such as we see in the proletariat, works not on men but on materials. It is only a class, bent on selfishly maintaining its class privileges, which has to go about to subvert the minds of people. It is only a negative purpose which must maintain itself by subversion. The proletariat remains pure and childlike at heart because it follows its creative instinct."

"How do you get along with the wardens?"

"Pleasantly enough. 'You have nothing on me,' I tell them. 'I shall be out of here in two months, but you will be in jail the rest of your lives.'"

"What do they say?"

"They don't resent it. People don't resent the obvious truth."

Our time was up. We walked together as far as the barred door, the attending warden visibly abashed and sullen. Why? Here was something new in his cosmos. All the other meetings between visitors and prisoners had a shadow of deprecation; something apologetic; either an admission or denial of guilt. Here was a meeting between visitor and

prisoner without the slightest admission of culpability, and that spirit was apparent: such a meeting as might have occurred in a hotel lobby. Guilt for the technical offense was acknowledged; but it was not acknowledged that the technical offense was guilt. Hence the warden's countenance. He felt himself somehow placed at a disadvantage, on the defensive; or, as he would have thought it, "put in a false light."

The door clanged shut.

The wind had backed into the southwest and was blowing a living gale. It whipped furious gusts of rain across the gray sea and the barren downs. Black and dim out of the rain-swept bay rose the wooded promontory of Manomet, as black and as dim as ever on a like day of easterly gale three centuries ago. Below the weathered gambrel roofs of the town was the sacred Rock, under the canopy of granite architecture.

"What sought they thus afar?"

"Bright jewels of the mine?"

"The wealth of seas, the spoils of war?"—

"They sought a faith's pure shrine."

"Aye, call it holy ground,

"The soil where first they trod;

"They left unstained what there they found—

"Freedom to worship God."

Wild roars the gale. Fierce pelts the rain. The breaking waves dash high. But the wind is the wind of March which unlocks the ice-fetters from wrist and ankle of the reviving earth. And the rain is the rain of Spring which holds to her lips the life-giving cup. And here by the roadside in old Plymouth town, still sacred to the name of liberty, a flowering shrub, early though the season is and rough though the weather may be, has had the hardihood to put forth its tiny buds. They are red.

Americans in Convention

AMERICANS have a convention habit. Rotary Clubs, Chambers of Commerce, labor unions, lodges and fraternal societies, milliners, fruit growers, hardware merchants, dancing masters, religious bodies and political parties hold national conventions at least every four years if not annually. If the man from Mars could stand the strain he would learn much about Americans by traveling from Atlantic City to Los Angeles to watch these conventions at work and at play. He could not escape at least one obvious conclusion; namely, that these bodies help to give unity to our somewhat diffuse American life. Something is accomplished when a man from Piqua, Ohio, sits next to a man from Portland, Oregon, on one side and one from Portland, Maine, on the other with a brother from Jacksonville, Florida, not far away. He might reach a second conclusion; namely, that American conventions are primarily emotional bodies—excellent places to study mob psychology. This is of course particularly, though not exclusively, true of political conventions. Few devices known to the ancient medicine man for stirring up unreflective emotion are ignored by the modern politician. Even in the virtuous atmosphere of the joint Labor Party-Committee of Forty-Eight convention at Chicago La Follette's friends tried stampede tactics. Pictures, banners, parades, shouting delegates, "thirty minutes of hysteria," failed to move the solid labor block which held the balance of power. The old-line conventions were orgies of third-rate rhetoric and machine-made enthusiasm. One can only comfort himself with the hope that nowhere else is language so copiously used to obscure thought.

Naturally gatherings like these have to be bossed.

All that can be hoped is that the boss will be reasonably disinterested and that the convention will be wise enough to pull down an unrepresentative boss. This year, with few exceptions, the bosses were strictly of the old-guard order. They knew politics and nothing else. The events of the last four years had taught them nothing. Charlie Murphy, under indictment in New York, was a power in San Francisco, and Mr. Murphy is probably not much worse than the rest. It was not only political conventions that were bossed by the old guard. Samuel Gompers and his henchmen kept their power in the A. F. of L. convention at Montreal. The one thing that interested the delegates most was the question of the Plumb Plan for railroads; but having endorsed it they meekly entrusted power to carry out their resolutions to a President who had honestly avowed his unalterable opposition to it. Deference to leaders never went farther than that. Perhaps it may be explained as a tribute to the remarkable power of leadership displayed by Samuel Gompers during all these years.

The great ecclesiastical conventions or councils, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist doubtless moved on a higher moral plane than the political gatherings, but they were equally conservative, and their old guard was equally in evidence. Diligent reading of reports of proceedings fails to discover any really significant social resolution or action taken by any of these bodies. Certain resolutions were adopted looking toward church unity, but both Presbyterians and Baptists turned down the Inter-church Movement, whether on account of its sins or its virtues was hard to say. With regard to social questions, these ecclesiastical bodies made a sorry showing. "The rather progressive social

creed of the Methodist Church," writes one of our correspondents, "was bitterly attacked in committee and stands only in name and not in spirit." There were perfunctory resolutions in behalf of a League of Nations, but none dealing with conscientious objection, with the denial of religious liberty, the continuance of the Russian blockade, or any of those causes which might have been expected to appeal to a Christian sense of pity if not of justice. It is impossible to dismiss this sorry showing of ecclesiastical bodies with regard to the application of Christianity in the time of the world's bitter need simply by saying that the day of the churches is done and that they are without influence. They may be losing rather than gaining in power, but they are very far from powerless. Most of them reported unusually large gifts to benevolent causes. They have in their ranks men and women who are still ready to sacrifice for the support of the organization. Doubtless they have also men and women who are trying to see life clearly and see it whole. But for the most part their voices were silent at official conventions. Bishop William F. McDowell's keynote speech at the Methodist conference was typical. It was eloquent; it was filled with evidence of good intentions; but it was in no sense prophetic. In one paragraph the speaker praised God that at last America finally had entered the war. He burst into verse.

"Then praise the Lord most high,
Whose strength has saved us whole,
Who bade us choose that flesh should die
And not the living soul."

A little later the same speaker bemoaned the present condition of the world, "war-torn, debt-ridden, in social ferment, economic revolution, governmental storm"; but neither he nor any of his hearers thought to inquire why if God sought to save the living soul by war the result should have been so tragic. The same failure to think things out ran all through the speech. What hope can there be for the church until it faces frankly the question of its own responsibility for war and the conditions out of which war sprang and summons the world to repentance by beginning itself to repent?

Perhaps the reactionary standard of this year's conventions is to be explained by a hold-over from war psychology; perhaps it measures the extent to which the red hysteria has spread. Perhaps it proves the degree to which the middle class, which dominated the conventions we have mentioned, instinctively reacts against any liberal movement or set of ideas which seems to imperil its own power. The United States Chamber of Commerce, for instance, a body which has at times been rather progressive, virtually hissed off the platform Matthew Woll, Vice-President of the A. F. of L., when he

denounced the Kansas Compulsory Industrial Courts.

One must, however, guard against the risk of overemphasizing the strength of conservatism in the United States. Official conventions of the established bodies always tend to be conservative. As a general rule, they register rather than initiate progressive changes. Not all conventions, however, were conservative. The Socialists in New York, and the Farmer-Labor Party in Chicago voiced the rising demand of labor for a new order and their hope for a new day. The much feared I. W. W. at its convention in Chicago renewed its condemnation of violence. (It is, by the way, a fact too often ignored that some of the most conservative unions of the A. F. of L. who protest most loudly against radicalism are precisely the ones to have shown themselves most willing to use violence, sabotage, or any weapon that seems convenient for furthering their own cause). The new and more hopeful unionism found expression in the state convention of the Pennsylvania A. F. of L. and in the re-election of that fine type of constructive radical, James Maurer. The needle-workers both of the International Ladies Garment Workers associated with the A. F. of L. and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, an independent union, demonstrated the true spirit of working-class solidarity. They are seeking to aid and to organize their fellow craftsmen in Europe and make international solidarity a reality and not a farce. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers under the brilliant leadership of Sidney Hillman and Joseph Schlossberg held a most encouraging convention in Boston and rededicated themselves to high standards of intelligent industrial unionism. Despite the attacks of the bosses upon it, that union is strong enough to turn some of its attention from the immediate exigencies of its struggle to education and consideration of standards in the industry.

Among the farmers, too, there are progressive as well as conservative forces. If the National Grange is conservative and anti-labor almost to the point of reaction, the National Council of Farm Organizations, on the other hand, has drawn up a progressive program of political demands and is willing to make common cause with labor. The Y. W. C. A. also proved that in religious circles the progressive movement is not entirely dead. Its convention adopted its industrial program in the face of the knowledge that by so doing it would lose the support of certain wealthy and prominent contributors.

In short, if our survey of conventions strengthens the belief that America of all nations is the main bulwark of the old social order, nevertheless it is evident that even here new forces are at work. Roger Babson's boast that labor is beaten may be temporarily true, but one must hope that in the hours of defeat the forces of progress everywhere are gathering wisdom and strength for the day of victory.

The Search for A New Party

IT is difficult to forecast the fate of the "third"—really fourth—party movement. We are blessed with many correspondents who were at the great Chicago convention. Some of them assure us that the Farmer-Labor party will have the support of all but an inconsiderable number of the Committee of Forty-Eight. Others hint that still another "third party" representative of no class but of the great body of American citizens who are disgusted with "privilege" will appear. Meanwhile the air is still thick with epithets and statements more denunciatory than explanatory. It seems rather a pity that the controversy at the joint convention of the Committee of Forty-Eight and the Labor Party should have been so bitter and that so much time should have been lost in wrangling. It made an unfavorable impression on the public and sidetracked proper consideration of nominations by the Farmer-Labor Convention. Whatever is the true history of the strategy of the two groups, the underlying and all important facts lay not in the realm of political maneuvering but of economic philosophy. The difference between the right wing of the Forty-Eighters and the Labor Party was real and vital even though it was often obscured by political bargaining. The organizing or official element in the Committee of Forty-Eight had a well-thought-out philosophy which was briefly expressed in the three planks of the so-called St. Louis platform, and more fully in Allen McCurdy's keynote speech and in Amos Pinchot's admirable articles in *The Freeman*. They did not accept the class-struggle theory; they wished to appeal to citizens irrespective of class who were discontented with political conditions; they wanted to abolish not private capital but privilege, by which they meant the monopoly of land, natural resources, and transportation facilities. They were not orthodox single-taxers, but their inspiration came from Henry George rather than Karl Marx. Finally, they had a profound faith in political action through the medium of a new party. The leaders of the Labor Party, and as the event proved the rank and file of the farmers and workers at the Convention, were in reality moderate Socialists. For entirely understandable reasons they did not want to use the name or state the whole philosophy of Socialism. Some of them would sincerely deny that they are Socialists. Nevertheless, their philosophy was derived from Karl Marx, modified by a faith in democratic management of industry of the sort that in Britain inspires Guild Socialism. They were class conscious—not that they wished to exclude anyone from their party, but merely that they felt that any new political movement must be built upon the economic interests of the producers. They were willing to waive a

good many of the ultimate problems of socialism (e. g., the ownership of land) in order to make an alliance between the farmers of the school of the Nonpartisan League—officially the League holds aloof—and trade unionists; but however opportunistic was their attitude, they could not accept the Forty-Eighters' distinction between privilege and capital or be content with the caution of the Forty-Eight leaders in regard to the workers' control of industry. They believed in political action, but they wrote in their platform the truth that "political democracy is only an empty phrase without industrial democracy."

Much time would have been saved if this conflict in philosophy had been quietly and frankly recognized by the leaders of both groups. Perhaps on the basis of it a temporary alliance might have been made between the two groups for immediate ends, many of which they have in common; but an amalgamation must inevitably have meant an explosion. Yet an amalgamation was attempted and the explosion came. The right wing leaders of the Forty-Eight seem to have got into their present plight because they did not realize that their nominal followers had not assimilated their philosophy. The Forty-Eighters were drawn together more by common protest than by anything else. Many of them went over heartily to the Farmer-Labor Party. The leaders of the Committee of Forty-Eight did not control their own convention. "Honest, well-meaning mush-heads," Amos Pinchot now calls some of the rank and file of his organization. It is quite possible that they would give another account of their differences of opinion!

In all this it is not necessary to cry "bad faith." The conflict was bound to arise whether or not the Labor Party had "a steam roller," whether or not the Forty-Eighters were "plutes" and "coupon cutting intellectuals." Even if La Follette had been secured as the candidate of a supposedly united party, in the long run these irreconcilable differences would have emerged. Good will have come out of the wrangling if it serves to educate Americans in some fundamentals of political and economic thinking. Good has come in the formation of the Farmer-Labor Party which cannot fail to serve a useful educational purpose. Its platform contains sound thinking on true Americanism, the nature of imperialism, and many economic matters. It is perhaps in a better position to fulfill its own function than if it depended primarily on some popular liberal leader like La Follette. It may ultimately grow into a real political force along the lines of the British Labor Party.

Yet one who believes that on the whole the Farmer-Labor Party platform and tactics are on sounder lines than those of the right wing of the

Committee of Forty-Eight can understand the feeling of many liberals who find themselves still deprived of any political means of expression. They are asked to choose between two conservative capitalistic parties as alike as two peas in a pod and two socialist parties one considerably more opportunistic than the other. Perhaps the liberals will make another effort to get together. The interesting question is whether they can ever do it. Mere dissatisfaction with things as they are is no basis for a well articulated political party. The liberals will have to accept some definite philosophy, and the psychology of liberalism makes for indefiniteness.

At any rate, it is a question whether economic forces do not compel the lines between capitalism and some form of socialism to be so sharply drawn that the attempt of the constructive liberal to find a way out by discrimination between objectionable privilege and unobjectionable capital is not foredoomed to failure. But we have no desire to dogmatize on the matter or to condemn in advance the effort to form a liberal party. Meanwhile we welcome the new Farmer-Labor Party and hope that it may play a notable part in training all the workers with hand and brain for the task of establishing a new and nobler social order. N. T.

The Appeal for Leadership

An Open Letter to Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Richard Roberts, and Others. By Robert Whitaker and J. Covington Coleman

THE pages of THE WORLD TOMORROW have been enriched again and again in recent months with the thoughtful and quietly impassioned appeals of the men whom we have named above on behalf of an awakening of the American people, and especially of the ministers, teachers, writers, and prominent publicists among us, to a leadership appropriate to these momentous times. Our nation as a whole is asked to lead the world out of the quagmire of its present distresses, lest, if we fail, we and all the world shall be engulfed in hopeless ruin. The very remarkable appeal to the "intelligentsia" which appeared in the April issue of THE WORLD TOMORROW, entitled *A Letter to the American People*, and which was signed by Henri Barbusse, is one of the noblest expressions which has been given of this faith in us and this desire toward us.

To challenge this faith and this desire seems like an ungracious response in view of the prominence of the men who make it, the eloquence of their carefully studied and profoundly felt phrasing of it, and the apparent desirability of the end itself. We are conscious of a desire to express agreement and appreciation rather than to give utterance to any dissent. And if our course is otherwise it is so because we think that the highest appreciation of their tremendous sincerity is utter sincerity upon our part, and because we further believe that to advance the actual and not the more obvious ends which they have in view it is necessary to question the whole line of reasoning which they present.

As to the seriousness of the times in which we live, and the importance of earnest heed to the call of the hour, we are not at all at variance with the men whose arguments we have in mind. But we

do question, with entire seriousness ourselves, both the appeal to America as peculiarly qualified for national leadership, and the appeal to "leading citizens" of any sort as the "saving salt" of America. And since the limitations of space in a single paper will not suffice for any adequate discussion of both of these items, we prefer here to emphasize the second point mentioned, as being in a way inclusive of the first. It is enough to say at this time that neither the history of the United States of America nor the present conditions here can justify, when well considered, the faith that we as a people are likely to play any such pioneer part in the human adventuring of the twentieth century as our fathers played in the quest for a more democratic world a hundred and fifty years ago.

IS AMERICA TO BE SAVED BY ITS "LEADERS"?

Waiving further discussion of this aspect of the matter so far as this present paper is concerned, let us proceed to the other point at issue: the assumption that America is to be saved by the awakening to reality and to educational effort of the leaders of our people, in church, and school, and press. As for including "statesmen" in this category, even our presidential year has thus far aroused very little confidence that we are going to be "saved" by our Wilsons and Roosevelts.

Is there any indication that these leaders, or, for that matter, the whole body of "thoughtful and moral people," are to prove themselves "the saviors of society" today? To deny this, of course, seems like denying the worth-whileness of all moral and intellectual appeal. But it is possible that the worth-whileness of moral and intellectual appeal requires for its justification a radical revision of its foundation and form. The approach to greater

importance is sometimes by way of greater humility.

If at the outset one may refer for a moment to religious authority, there is certainly little either in the experience or expressions of Jesus to justify such an appeal. It is in the most "intellectual" and "moral" of the gospels, the fourth gospel, that the negative attitude of the leaders of His day toward Him is summed up in the searching and almost cynical inquiry, "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?" This was their own question, not His. And their's seems to have been a very conclusive reply, an answer which "the rulers and the Pharisees" have repeated in every world crisis since. For the appeal to history is quite as fatal to the emphasis of the leadership of the "better classes," in any accepted use of that term, as is the appeal to religious authority. That other saying of Jesus, however cryptic its connection, "as it was in the days of Noah," is an unanswerable summary of the failure of the world's leadership in the crises of history. It is not merely that in the face of every impending revolution of the ages the multitudes have gone on "eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage . . . until the flood came and took them all away," but it is unquestionably true that this blindness in the face of social crisis has been more accentuated than relieved by the "blind leaders" who have led the blind following of all countries and centuries "into the ditch."

One need not dwell upon these more obvious observations. It is the distinctive achievement of our day that we have begun to learn the scientific approach to this problem of the ages, and that we are able to analyze both the causes and the significance of it in a way which removes it from the fields both of preachiness and of pessimism.

THE TWO FALLACIES BEHIND LEADER-WORSHIP

We have assumed two things in the past, as do most of those who in the present either hope too much in the effectiveness of the intellectual and moral appeal or despair too much because of its futility. We have assumed that man is primarily an individual, and he is not; he is primarily a herd animal. We have assumed that man is primarily a rational creature, and he is not; he is primarily an emotional, or better yet, a vital being. That is, man acts mainly, not from his own preferences or convictions, but from the impact of his group or the social whole upon him. And man acts mainly not from reasoned, logical processes, but from the momentum of the life process itself.

Our national history affords one very convenient and when carefully considered very convincing illustration of both of these contentions. Neither those who supported slavery nor those who opposed slavery in the great conflict between North and South which culminated in the Civil War acted primarily either as individuals or as rational beings.

The North was not more individual in its attitude toward this issue than was the South. Social pressure toward conformity was heaviest at the South, that was all. Nor was the North essentially more rational than the South. The economic process in the North was more on the side of social and therefore of moral progress. Northern people were not "superior" to Southern people, nor was the average of moral and intellectual leadership actually higher. The "herd" moved forward in the North, and held back in the South. And as the crisis ripened feeling was as dominant in one section as the other.

Such reasoning, it will be said, is "materialistic," "pessimistic," "atheistic." But this is not argument, and therefore all such quick and easy ways of disposing of apparently disagreeable facts may be disregarded here. But this is our main contention: that not only is there no religious authority of highest repute to back up a special appeal to special classes on behalf of the saving of society; not only is history conclusively against the effectiveness of such appeal; and not only is modern sociological science a revelation of the fallacy of this old personal philosophy; but the appeal itself is really a denial of the very hopefulness and faith on which it seems to rest.

FAITH IN THE MANY THE TRUE OPTIMISM

It is not optimism to appeal to the few to save the many, even if history did not force upon us the most pessimistic proof of the futility of such appeal. The whole hero-worship cult, however diffused our heroism may be over considerable classes or groups of men and women, is fundamentally an impeachment of the human process as a whole. It is the "all-we-like-sheep" interpretation of life, which, however much it seems to have in its favor, is not true to the profoundest study of history and its modern illuminator, economics. And the emphasis of the "herd instinct," paradoxical as it may seem, is not a reaffirmation of this pious pessimism of the ages, but is rather a scientific demonstration of the highest worth both to the spirit of an intelligent and impregnable optimism, and to faith in an eventually efficient democracy.

For to believe that the few are more powerful than the many is not so much an appreciation of the few as it is a disparagement of the many. And to insist that a single faculty of man, the reasoning faculty, is of more consequence to the evolutionary process than the sum total of the forces which compose his vitality is not to exalt reason so much as it is to discredit life itself. If we are to be saved by "talk" (and that the talk of the few) as opposed to the "experience" of the whole mass of mankind, then it would seem that the human pyramid has been built upon its apex and not upon its base. And all appeals to the apex to come to the relief of the pyramid when the storms shake it are not only destined to disappointment, but they tend to

obscure the real foundations of our confidence in the future.

America is not going to save the world. And the "nice folks" are not going to save America. But both the "nice folks" and America are going to be saved as part of the whole vast process which is working itself out much more in the total of human experience than in any leadership of any sort of folks anywhere in the world. What "liberals" and "intellectuals" and "nice folks" and all other "specially favored folks" the world over need is to realize not their own consequence but their own inconsequence as compared with the momentum of the mass. Back of all our special appeals there is a certain patronage of the masses which is as untrue to the largest hopefulness as it is untrue to the deepest understanding of life. The world's greatest need today is a repudiation of the whole doctrine of leadership. Faith in the divineness of us all is of far more consequence than faith in the divineness of any one of us or any group of us in a particular way, and faith in the divineness of us all means the persuasion that the processes which concern us all and involve us all are of more consequence to every one of us than are the special processes of any special number of us to humanity as a whole. What has long been mistakenly called "the materialistic conception of history" is really the highest type of faith in something beyond matter, "the increasing purpose" which cannot be expressed in less than the total life of the universe, and which does not admit even a "God" in any exclusively superior sense. And all our talk of "democracy" is as superficial as the war appeals which have become a mockery now, unless we mean by democracy something vastly larger than the leading of the many into the ways of wisdom and rightness by the superior virtue and acumen of the few; unless we mean, indeed, that the totality of life is more to be trusted than any fraction of it, and that salvation for any of us can only come eventually through the justification of the process which belongs in no special degree to any of us. The only leadership needed is the leadership of those who have lost all conceit of country, class or condition in the sense of the infinitely superior importance of the universal whole.

If the present leadership in Russia seems to those who believe in the greatness of Russia's achievement a contradiction of what we have set forth, the answer is not far to seek. The Russian leadership is great by very reason of its emphasis on the mass, and its sense of utter dependence for any final success upon the mass. Either the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky will more and more merge itself into mass development, mass self-expression, or else it will become a menace and an obstacle to Russian progress. The only leadership that can justify itself is the leadership which does not seek to lead the masses, but rather to coincide with the movement of life and interpret life; which

in other words identifies itself utterly in its deepest consciousness with the stream of evolution; and seeks more and more of self-abnegating unity with the actual common experience of mankind.

O Ship of State!

An Independence Day Meditation.

"O Ship of State, what are you sailing over?"

"Bones of my fighting-men, who died
That there might be across the sea
Another course than this I ride;
Blood of free Russia, shed beside
Her hearth, with unavailing blow;
The skulls of children that starved slow
In Wurtemberg and Saxony—
My mercy to a conquered foe;
The fetters forged on Hungary;
The unlaid threat of Mexico;
The ghost of every hope that went
To victory's accomplishment;
Measureless fear; and gulfs of apathy:—
Over these I lightly go."

"O Ship, it needs no tablet riven,
No Sinaian lightning, to assume
The truth unalterably given.
The ship that dares the will of Heaven
Is sailing onward to its doom.
I see the bravest of your crew
Day and night in irons bound,
Because they served an unborn good.
I see your captains run aground,
Pursuing pitiless desires.
How long before the brotherhood
Of all who tend your central fires
Take the helm, and steer you straight?
It is the day for which I wait."

"When the many stand as one,
(As the captains long have stood);
When their chart is boldly planned
To the yet-unsighted land;
When, the power within their hand,
Forgiving as the saints forgave,
They sink the old wrong in a grave
Deep within oblivion
And the old truth raise, to view
By its aid a country new,
Those who tend my central fires
Irresistibly shall steer
To ports undreamed of. Year by year
Stars send their light through heaven's profound
abyss
To be witnesses of this.

VIOLA C. WHITE.

After the Winnipeg Strike -- What?

By A. VERNON THOMAS

FOR a couple of months now six of the convicted Winnipeg strike-leaders have been working on a prison farm some miles east of Winnipeg. They are working in God's free air, and, for the time being, are necessarily relieved from those material and spiritual responsibilities which today are weighing many a "free" man down. Their sentence is for one year with the exception of the returned soldier Bray, whom the jury honored only to the extent of finding him "a common nuisance." His sentence was six months.

Two of the strike-leaders were acquitted. One of these was F. J. Dixon, whose speech to the jury in his own defense has become historic and is already something of a Canadian classic. Dixon's is now a name to conjure with in the Canadian West. He is a splendid, fearless, simple fellow. At the last general election in Manitoba he received the largest majority polled for any candidate. Given health and strength Dixon will go far, for he is still a young man.

The other acquitted man was Alderman A. A. Heaps, of Winnipeg. Why Heaps was acquitted is something of a mystery. He admits himself he is just as guilty and just as innocent as the others. The charges against "Jim" Woodsworth, one of the noblest sons Canada ever bore, whose story I told some time ago in the columns of *THE WORLD TOMORROW*, were dropped after Dixon's acquittal.

Another strike-leader, "Bob" Russell, was less fortunate than the six now working on the prison farm. Russell, along with these six, and Heaps, acquitted, were to have been tried together. But to circumvent the right of each of the accused to four peremptory challenges to jurymen, the Crown Prosecutor decided to try Russell separately, thus reducing the peremptory challenges to four. Russell was convicted and given two years in the penitentiary, although he was accused on precisely the same counts as the other seven.

If it be asked whether the imprisoned men are likely to be released at an early date, the answer, to be of any use, must take account of the broad facts of the situation, and these are not encouraging. It seems to me that we are too apt to overlook the fundamental truth that the war has militarized the general population of every country that took part in it. And the world, after all, can rise no higher than the thoughts and ideals in the hearts of the people who compose it.

What the war has done is to change the outlook of the man in the street from one of liberalism to one of conservatism. Disposed formerly to be generous, he has become ungenerous. Disposed to be trustful, he has become fearful. His faith in him-

self and his fellows has been weakened. He used to believe that a great deal could be done to bridge the gaps in our civilization. Now he sees only the difficulties of bridge construction. In a word, he has become militarized. For militarism isn't something which has to do primarily with the armies and navies and conscription and war. Militarism is simply a condition of the mind, affecting the details of everyday life.

In the highest degree tragic was the evil wrought by the war both in Canada and in the United States. And largely for the same reason. In both countries a substantial barrier of generosity and goodwill had to be broken down to get the people into the war. For before the war the Canadian, and the American, man in the street was a creature of liberal impulses. Though not a saint and though picayune in some directions, he was disposed to take big chances on the liberal point of view. Hatred on a national scale was foreign to his make-up.

To draw such people into the war it was necessary to dry up this fund of good-will and overcome much kindness of nature. Consequently it was necessary to represent the enemy as being extraordinarily vicious and ferocious, lacking the smallest redeeming feature and fit only to be extirpated from the planet. The task was accomplished and the result we have with us today—decent men and women everywhere degraded and impoverished in their ideals and unresponsive to appeals of truth, justice, and honor.

This is not a digression: it is, in my opinion, the essence of the situation in Western Canada. A considerable portion of the population is not only satisfied to have the strike leaders in jail, but gloats over the fact that they are there. One of the pathetic features of the situation is the dead silence of the farmers' leaders and the farmers' organs during the hounding and persecution of men like Woodsworth, Dixon, and Ivens, men who have in the past helped the farmers' movement with voice and pen. And yet this is not the most pathetic side to the struggle. Most tragic of all is the fact that the two wings of the organized labor movement, the protagonists of the One Big Union and the adherents of the International Unions, are expending far more energy in fighting one another than in combating their opponents.

These are the depressing features of the situation, and it seems to me futile to try and gloss them over. Happily there are some things to encourage. True to type, our militarist friends, in their blind frenzy, overdid their part. The result is that injustice sticks out of the whole business so clearly that ordinary citizens in their calm moments cannot

fail to observe it. Thus the forces of "law and order" have on their hands a victory which, beyond giving them a gratifying sense of revenge, is bringing no satisfaction and is, in fact, causing them no little concern.

Within the past few weeks I had a conversation about the Winnipeg trials with a minister high up in the Methodist Church of Canada. He told me that his son, who is a lawyer, considered that the Winnipeg trial judge had been very unfair and that the whole trial left much to be desired even on the score of good law. The opinion held by this lawyer was shared, I understood, by many of his fellow lawyers. I think it is fair to assume that wide circles in Canada lean to the opinion that the spirit of retaliation rather than that of justice characterized the conduct of the case against the strike leaders. But the point is this, that neither my friend, the Methodist minister, nor his son would dream of saying publicly what the former said to me. Canada and the United States are countries in which it is still risky to express unpopular opinions.

Fate, in a most tragic way, has fought for the strike leaders. Barely had the men been incarcerated when the baby boy of Mr. Ivens died. A tremendous wave of popular sympathy went out to the imprisoned father, and he was allowed to go home and be with his sick wife during the funeral. The funeral resolved itself into a remarkable demonstration. Many thousands of people, men, women, and children, followed the little coffin through the streets of Winnipeg. In the procession were large delegations of returned soldiers. To the cemetery, several miles outside the city, some three thousand persons walked in the rain. At the graveside Jim Woodsworth, arrested strike leader, and, like Ivens, a former Methodist minister, read the burial service over the little body.

Another thing which has tended to create sympathy for the imprisoned men is the exceptional ability they displayed in court. They made deeply impressive speeches. These men, few of them with advantages of schooling or station as these things are usually understood, left the "learned lawyers" far behind in rhetorical ability, in their range of reading, in their ability to quote prose and poetry, and, perhaps most important of all, in their understanding and study of social and economic questions. The daily papers, for very shame, could not ignore the notable addresses made by the men and the dissemination of the reports undoubtedly caused some revulsion of feeling in favor of the strike leaders.

In the foregoing I have given my own view, a long-distance view, gained from newspapers, letters, and conversations, of the Winnipeg situation. Frankly, I am pessimistic. I see in the unrest which is surging in Canada and in every other country chiefly the spirit of the war, a prolongation, as it were, in other fields of the madness of the war years. I am profoundly impressed by the theory

that the evil and wickedness of the war will have to be paid for in the degradation of our civilization in the years immediately ahead. To me the idea that the world is in some way going to move forward quickly in the near future is entirely illusory. The only hope for us, as I see things, is to get men and women soberly to face the truth about the war, and, on the basis of that knowledge, to rebuild and reconstruct. The outlook for this being done is not any too propitious.

However, my own is only a fallible view, and I am now going to present another opinion as to the situation in Winnipeg and in Canada generally. I am going to quote from a letter I received recently from Jim Woodsworth, who knows Western Canada thoroughly and who has traveled through its vast extent several times during the past few years. He is at the present time making a trip from Winnipeg to the Pacific Coast. Woodsworth writes me as follows:

"As to the verdict [against the strike leaders], I think a considerable number of people are beginning to discover that the strike was not just what they had been told. The funeral of Ivens' child touched the imagination and sympathy of a number. Not only the crown lawyers but the public want to save their face. Hence they are glad of the verdict—but find no satisfaction in it. The trouble is there is no leadership. People generally are feeling the high cost of living and see no way out. Yet opinion does not head up into a movement.

"The strike was in one sense a failure, of course. On the other hand, schedules in many trades have been more easily put through this spring. The employers, too, learned a lesson. In many ways the strike made the Labor movement in Western Canada. Notwithstanding the split in the Labor ranks, engineered by the government and the international leaders, Labor was never so self-conscious. From Fort William [Canadian head of the Great Lakes] to Prince Rupert, almost every Labor man followed with a personal interest all the details of the Winnipeg trials. A wonderful impetus has been given to political action. A by-product is the Labor Church—the attempt at least to interpret modern life in spiritual terms.

"I don't know just how long the farmers' organizations will last, but I feel sure there is a real movement at work among them. The material basis and the spiritual aspirations are often not far apart. I do think the farmer is becoming more self-reliant as he realizes his dependence upon the system, though this may seem a paradox. In other words, his class consciousness is developing.

"The present farmers' movement is born of a different age from the old Patron movement and there is a different spirit in it. Many of the farmers' leaders breathe a spiritual atmosphere. No doubt the farmer exaggerates his own importance, but a good many at least want to work out a better system for the country at large.

"I hardly know what to think of the Dominion Labor Party. It is not yet a party. It has no policy and but little leadership. It is only in the making. The industrial centers are so small and so far apart that it is difficult to get anything like a united effective effort. The East is conservative. Then in the West, especially in British Columbia, the Socialist Party of Canada maintains a doctrinaire and uncompromising attitude that makes cooperation impossible. The industrial cleavage between the O. B. U. and the A. F. of L. is complicated by a cleavage between the S. P. of C. and the D. L. P. They are not altogether parallel.

"Canada is an unhappy country. Politically dependent on England, it is industrially and commercially dependent on the United States. Racially it is a second Ireland with a few Balkan states thrown in!

"The war has, of course, demoralized our thinking, but I am not pessimistic. The sentences passed on the strike leaders show that we're not quite so vicious yet as the United States. There is a pretty healthy protest against the espionage system. The old-country English working man is independent and is fighting the battle. The older Canadian is well-nigh hopeless, as hopeless in fact as the hundred-per-cent. American. But out of the welter new ideals are emerging.

"Take our Labor Church. Last Sunday the theater was crowded. The people swallowed an hour's talk without flinching, then wanted to hear more. We spoke of the futility of the war, and the returned men applauded. Think of them marching in the funeral procession of Ivens' child! The idea of brotherhood and fair play meets a response everywhere with the Labor group.

"After all, the unmasking of the churches is a decided gain. We can now begin to build. But everywhere we need leadership and courage. There is a real danger that we may descend to 'the servile state,' but the forces of a better day are, I think, pressing ever upward."

Thus Jim Woodsworth. When he wrote the above he never dreamed it would see other eyes than mine, but Woodsworth never says anything on public questions that all men may not read. What think you, reader? This man was arrested last summer on a charge of sedition, thrown into jail and kept there for a week without bail. One of his offenses, solemnly put down in the indictment, was to have quoted Isaiah. The grand jury found a true bill, but the government eventually dropped the case.

NOTE:—Since the foregoing was written a general election has been held in the Province of Manitoba, with startling results. Three of the strike leaders now in prison, William Ivens, John Queen, and George Armstrong, have been elected to the Manitoba Legislature. A fourth, R. B. Russell, failed of election by only a few votes. F. J. Dixon, who was also arrested, tried, and acquitted,

after every effort had been made to convict him, headed the poll in Winnipeg by a huge plurality. In the Province of Manitoba, all told, eleven Labor, Labor-Farmer, or Socialist candidates have been elected, forming the largest opposition group. The Government, nominally Liberal, has lost half its members and no longer commands a majority in the Legislature. A group of ten Farmer-Independents has been elected. There are fifty-five members in the House, and the Government will have twenty-five at the most.

An Achievement and An Appeal

TO look at the governments of western Europe or of our own country is to see little that is encouraging. But life is bigger than government. The French politicians may find problems of just taxation insoluble, but French peasants are making amazing progress in bringing devastated fields under cultivation. Jingoism everywhere still preaches hate, but the people of Italy, Switzerland, Holland, and England are taking Austrian children into their homes to save them. The American Red Cross may at times have turned its relief into political channels to defeat revolutionary movements it did not like; nevertheless, American relief has meant life to thousands of people. Especially have the Friends rendered a unique service of good will in Austria and Germany. We quote a few paragraphs from a recent report of its Executive Secretary:

"I need not dwell upon the necessity for relief in Germany. Suffice it to say that the report last week from Germany was that there were 615,000 children being fed in 87 cities and districts through 3,289 feeding centers.

"The number of children being fed will increase to over 700,000 and then during the harvest period will probably decrease to about 400,000. This will be done during the time when fresh vegetables and fruit will be more plentiful.

"Beginning with September the number of children fed will be increased again to at least 500,000, and will be increased to a million if funds from America can be secured to make this possible.

"I, therefore, want to make a final report on the feeding up to July 1, 1920. To date we have received a little over \$3,000,000. . . .

"Distribution has been made through German agencies.

"We have borne all our overhead expenses and our workers have worked without salaries. Therefore, we believe that we have been true to the trust you gave us when you contributed your funds through this organization.

"Toward the needs for next winter we have already secured \$2,000,000 which is to be used exclusively for child-feeding. To feed the number of children that ought to be fed from now until next summer we estimate will require about \$8,000,000. You see, therefore, that this \$2,000,000 which we have already secured is only a beginning."

The Working People's Nonpartisan Political League

By FRED A. HARDING

ORGANIZED labor in Minnesota has never considered the ethics of the strike. It has learned, however, that the strike is at best a means for obtaining only temporary relief, a remedy that has never cured and sometimes kills.

Recognizing that the "system" is to blame for a majority of the ills that afflict the wage earners, that craft organization can never change the "system," organized labor in Minnesota and considerable that isn't organized has gone into politics. An organization has been effected in which all persons who work by hand or brain are eligible to membership. This organization is known as the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League.

If you are good at guessing, you have already guessed that the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League has formed an alliance with the National Nonpartisan League in Minnesota. The working people's league has a membership of approximately fifty thousand, and the farmers' organization sixty thousand in that state. Together, without counting the "sympathetic vote," they will cast one hundred and ten thousand ballots. The total vote of Minnesota is around three hundred and seventy thousand. I am not including the woman vote, for at this writing the "perfect thirty-six" has not ratified the federal suffrage amendment.

The Working People's Nonpartisan Political League was brought into being at the annual convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor last July. The organization includes in its membership all local unions that affiliate by paying into the working people's league twenty-five cents a year for every member in the union. A campaign fund is raised by charging individuals three dollars for membership. The three-dollar dues includes six months' subscription to any one of the labor papers in the state or to the *Minnesota Leader*, the official organ of the National Nonpartisan League in Minnesota. Individual membership in the working people's league is voluntary.

From its inception, the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League has followed the example of the farmers' organization by having a "program." The program summarized reads as follows:

1. Recognition and enforcement of right of collective bargaining.
2. Eight-hour day with one full day's rest in seven.
3. State insurance of workmen's compensation.

4. Establishment and operation of government work during periods of depression.
5. Public ownership of all public utilities, and nationalization and development of natural resources, including unused land.
6. Development of cooperation to reduce the high cost of living.
7. Tax reform.
8. Government insurance.
9. Equal suffrage. Equal pay for men and women doing similar work.
10. Government supervision of all industry and ultimately control of industry and commerce by those who work by hand or brain.
11. Federal department of education to insure uniform and efficient educational system with academic freedom and economic independence of teachers.
12. Restoration of freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

The purpose of the organization is expressed in the following language:

"The purpose of this organization shall be to unite members of organized and unorganized labor into a political league together with those in sympathy with the interests of the common people, in order that representatives may be elected to office who will enact, interpret, and enforce laws that will serve the general welfare in accordance with the platform and program adopted by this organization."

Last March, the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League held its state convention in St. Paul. In another hall, at the same time, delegates to the state convention of the National Nonpartisan League convened. Candidates were selected and all differences ironed out by a joint conference committee, the final report of which was ratified by both conventions. Resolutions adopted by the two conventions were welded into a state platform to which all of the candidates subscribed.

The platform follows:

Believing that the people of Minnesota are entitled to definite pledges of performance from all who seek their votes, we, the candidates endorsed by the state conventions of organized labor, hereby declare that we stand upon these principles:

1. We believe in orderly progress under our democratic form of government; in reform by the ballot, not by the bullet; in evolution, not revolution.

2. To make democracy workable it is self-evident that the people must preserve their constitutional rights of free speech, a free press and peaceful assemblage. We propose, if elected, to see that these rights are preserved, to substitute law and order for mob rule and to use the police powers of the state for the benefit of all the people and not in behalf of a privileged few.

3. Our state and nation are heavily in debt, and high taxes, paid directly and indirectly by the common citizen, add to the ever-increasing cost of living. We demand that taxes on large incomes and excess profits be continued and increased, so that surplus wealth may be compelled to pay the money cost of the war, so that profiteering may be discouraged and the burden of taxes be shifted to those best able to bear it.

4. The primary purpose of the organizations of the farmers and workers of the state is, as stated in their platforms, "to take the government out of the hands of special privilege and restore it to the people." Standing firmly upon this principle we endorse and subscribe to the Minnesota program of the National Nonpartisan league and the Working People's Nonpartisan Political league.

In carrying out these principles we pledge ourselves, if elected, to take the following immediate steps:

1. To enact and enforce net profits tonnage tax laws that will compel adequate payment by interests now despoiling our natural resources to build up immense private fortunes, in which they have been protected by the present administration. Such taxes will relieve other taxpayers from the crushing burden of taxes they now bear.

2. To stand for the eight-hour day in all industries except where, as in farming, natural conditions will not allow its establishment.

3. To provide state guarantee of bank deposits.

4. To revise grain grading and inspection rules in the interests of the producers.

5. To provide a plan of workmen's compensation, administered by the state, that will bring injured workmen, their families and dependents certain and full relief without recourse to the courts.

6. To recognize the right of workers to organize and deal collectively with their employers, through representatives of their own choice.

7. To protect and encourage cooperative enterprises.

8. To secure full equality under the law for men and women.

9. To take all other immediate steps possible under the constitution to put into effect the complete Minnesota programs of the National

Nonpartisan league and the Working People's Nonpartisan Political league.

Dr. Henrik Shipstead, a real liberal, was endorsed as a Republican candidate for governor. Captain George H. Mallon, the most-decorated former service man in Minnesota, was the choice of the two conventions for lieutenant-governor. Mallon is active in the World War Veterans, a rival organization of the American Legion. He is a sprinkler fitter. In the hope that women would have a vote in the primary election, the conventions upset political tradition by endorsing a woman—Miss Lily Anderson, a farmer's daughter—for state treasurer. The rest of the ticket comprised farmers and men who have earned the trust of labor and the farmers. One of these—George L. Siegel, candidate for justice of the supreme court—was immediately branded a friend of the I. W. W. by the controlled press. The basis for this silly accusation lies in the fact that Mr. Siegel defended about forty miners, who were accused of being I. W. W.'s by the steel trust on account of their activity in organizing the mine workers. Every one of the alleged I. W. W.'s was acquitted.

Cooperating with the farmers' organization, dubbed by its opponents as the "Townleyites," the workers count on electing all of their candidates in the November general election on the "farmer-labor" ticket. The campaign is now on.

The same candidates for state offices were defeated in the Republican primary June 21 by narrow margins. The candidate for governor was defeated by less than ten thousand votes as a result of a merger of old-guard Republicans and Democrats in the Republican primary, notwithstanding the farmers' and labor organizations carried fifty-four counties out of eighty-six, which is twenty more than entered the League fold in the 1918 election. Over-confidence resulted in fifty-thousand supporters of the League ticket remaining away from the polls. Fraud by election judges is also charged. The League candidates for attorney-general was leading his opponent by four thousand votes until the vote of the city of Duluth, home of the steel trust, was revised. As a result of the revision, the Leaguer lost the Republican nomination by one thousand six hundred and twenty-two votes.

The most notable feature of the primary election was the nomination of Rev. O. J. Kvale, Leaguer, over Congressman Volstead, supporter of the Graham and Sterling sedition bills. Prohibition was not an active issue in the campaign, for both men are dry. The working people's league renominated Congressmen Keller and Carss. Siegel, the League's candidate for supreme court justice, was also nominated, together with legislative candidates in seventy-eight counties.

As a result of the primary election, the farmer and labor organizations have decided to put up the same ticket for the fall campaign on the "far-

mer-labor" ticket. The farmer-labor party was created in 1918, when the Nonpartisan league ran three independent candidates in the general election, nominating them at that time by petition. Charles Lund, a farmer and banker, had to be substituted for Miss Anderson as a candidate for state treasurer in the Republican primary because of the failure of a thirty-sixth state to ratify the federal suffrage amendment before the time of filing. Mr. Lund has been retained on the farmer-labor ticket.

Labor in the working people's league and farmers in the Nonpartisan league are confident of sweeping the state in the general election and re-

moving the causes of the present unrest that prevails in the city and on the farm. The belief is general that the Democrats will have to make a fight for their own ticket in a presidential campaign year and withdraw their support from the Republican candidates. Then, too, the victory of the Nonpartisan league in North Dakota last June has given new heart to the common people of Minnesota.

In the opinion of political observers, Minnesota is about to go through a revolution—a bloodless revolution—a revolution in which ballots will take the place of bullets. To be sure, the controlled press calls this "bolshivism."

At The Station

WE would remind the reader of the following sketch that while the conditions depicted were true of the Russia of 1918, they have changed materially today. The worst detractors of Bolshevism admit that the so-called Red Terror—never as bad as the White—is a thing of the past; and it is well known that Lenin is now making use of "bourgeois" talent in the administration of industry—the author of this sketch himself is head of the conference of religious groups which passes on conscientious objectors. Nevertheless, the whole question of the justifiability of coercion or violence to bring about political ends is so acute just now that we believe the sketch will be of unusual interest to our readers. As in the case of "The Christ of the Bolsheviks," which we printed in our April issue, this also appeared in the Tolstoyan magazine, The Voice of Tolstoy, and Unity. We are indebted to Mr. Isaac Don Levine for permission to use it, and to Mr. Lawrence Müller for the translation.

THERE is a small crowd at the station waiting for a car. Many have been waiting for several hours. Some, weary of the delay, conclude that the safest thing to do is to walk.

After waiting half an hour, I, too, left, and with me a man in the uniform of an official of the city street-car system. As we walked, we fell into converse.

"Are you a Moscovite or an outsider?" inquires my fellow-traveler.

"I am only living here temporarily."

He looked me over carefully. "What do you do? Are you in some speculative business? A lot of people are doing that just now—it's a convenient occupation."

"No, I'm connected with a publication and I help in distributing the writings of Tolstoy."

"Oh, in the book end . . . It's a good thing to distribute Tolstoy's works. They're good books. Your occupation is useful."

"Yes, I think so too—particularly just now."

He gave me a quick sidelong glance. "Why do you say 'particularly just now'? Are you dissatisfied with present conditions? I think they're very good."

Noting the tone of his voice, I looked at him and went on:

"Well, I consider that the distribution of the writings of Tolstoy is particularly important now because just now there is a reign of open force, violence, and malice, and people ought to stop and think whether they're going in the right direction. The works of Tolstoy, in my opinion, will help them to decide better than any others. Now will you let me ask you why you defend the present state of affairs so readily?"

"How can you help defending it? At least we have control by the real socialists. The real proletariat is ruling. The others have been riding us long enough."

"So now you want to ride them? Is that the best you can do? Or isn't there something better?"

He grew thoughtful. . . . "No, comrade, that is not my view. Though I am for the Bolsheviks, still I'm not one myself, and I won't deny that a lot of people have joined them that are evil and have evil motives. I feel ashamed that only that element is visible to the public while the best isn't evident."

"You are mistaken. Many want to see the better side and do see it. . . . But don't you think that the method employed in bringing about this change—in itself good—antagonizes people: violence, oppression, executions? We've suffered enough of those delights under the autocracy, and we don't want a repetition of them. You admit yourself that many sinister elements have joined with you. Then you ought to get rid of them, or at least make some visible effort to do it. Your ideas and your aims may be good, but the method of accomplishing them—force and fraud . . .

you can't expect to get very far that way."

"I don't think you put it fairly. We do work, you know. Take me as an example. I'm a member of the city traction commission. We workmen took over the whole business into our own hands. If it wasn't for us, the cars would have stopped running long ago. The old Duma brought about the break-down of the system deliberately by not repairing the cars or providing coal."

"I don't know about that and won't dispute it. If the old Duma did as you say, it certainly doesn't deserve commendation. Still, some sort of control is essential, and also it's necessary to understand a business in order to run it. Now tell me, do you think you're really fitted for such administrative work?"

"No—but no one helps us."

"Well, would you want that help no matter who offered it, or would it make a difference whether it was a bourgeois or not? Personally, I should be very glad to see the management not only of the trolley system but of every other business pass into the hands of the workers, but I'm afraid not all of them are prepared for it. In picking someone for a particular job, what is your test? Is it only the fact that he must not be a bourgeois?"

"According to you, we ought to go on our knees, then, to get them to help us! No, that will never be. We shall get along by ourselves. But there will be no more bourgeois."

"Well, what are you going to do with them? Are you going to kill them off?"

"No. Why kill them? We'll just hound them. And if they don't learn better, they'll have themselves to blame."

"That's all well and good; but in oppressing the bourgeoisie, as you call them, don't you also unwillingly oppress the poor? For instance, you manage the street-car system. Though you admit you have no experience, you stick at it obstinately and won't give a single bourgeois a chance even if the whole business should go to ruin. And cars are getting more and more scarce. We both just wasted half an hour waiting for a car, and how many more people are standing there waiting—among them a good half not bourgeoisie at all? If it keeps up like this, the cars will stop altogether. Who is to set them going? The people! . . . I think that is the state of affairs in other lines. To be sure, the honesty of the administration, the desire to serve in the front rank, and especially keeping always keeping in mind the interests of the masses—all that is very good. Many people will agree with that. But you've got to have the ability to do it. You can't do it by simply dividing the whole world into two classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat. Who is going to define the real difference between them?"

"Well, what do you think we ought to do about it all?"

"I'm at a loss to know . . . But at least I believe we ought to realize more clearly that good cannot come by means of evil and violence—and that we ought to have more respect for *man*. The most precious thing, the best thing men have, is life. And just now life isn't worth a kopeck. They rob and kill for a pittance, for nothing at all. Instead of love and consideration for one another we have strife. Seize and kill—anything is permitted, anything is possible. Do you think we can bring to pass a better way of life by such means as that?"

My fellow-traveler fell silent. We approached a new station.

Suddenly he stopped, took my hand, and asked: "Is all this to be found in the books you are distributing?"

"That? Oh, much more. Didn't you ever read any of Tolstoy?"

"No. I've only read stories. I haven't had a chance to read serious books."

"Read them, now, then. I'm sorry I have nothing with me, but I can tell you where you can get them." I gave him an address.

He took out a little notebook, wrote down the address, pressed my hand heartily, and we parted.

Making Good Enemies;

THE Interchurch World Movement is to be continued on a greatly reduced scale and the famous steel report is to be issued to the public. So much for the bare facts. More important are revelations the New York *World* has been making of the bitter opposition the steel investigation engendered. Libel and actual attempt at theft were used by certain enemies of this effort to get at the truth of the steel strike. We doubt whether this unscrupulous opposition had as much to do with the troubles of the Movement as its own errors. But liberals may be inclined to forgive much to any organization which provokes the wrath of Mr. R. M. Easley of the National Civic Federation. He has acknowledged sending out letters to members of his organization (some of them connected with the Steel Trust) urging that four gentlemen "in important positions in the Interchurch movement, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, and the Y. M. C. A." be "kicked out of their position or at any rate put in places where they can not poison anyone but themselves." He does not say, what we happen to know, that the alleged information against some of the men attacked was got by spies who used underhand methods. To their shame be it said, certain official directors of at least two religious organizations listened to these spies' reports. Fortunately, however, as yet the anti-red mania of the National Civic Federation has not resulted in definite action against the men its secretary attacked.

Pacifism in Prussia

By EVELYN SHARP *

IT seemed like taking part in a monstrous satire, a satire anybody might have written if only one had thought of it in time.

The long, gray-washed, classic lecture hall was filled from end to end with students, some rich, some poor, a few looking well-nourished, many looking hungry—all the types that may be found in post-war Berlin outside the University, with the addition here of a handful of gaily dressed "*Kaiser-treu*" duellists, still at their schoolboy game of whipping up a dying mediævalism, while others, younger and freer of tradition, go marching on. Though, as in England, the reactionary element in the whole University is probably in the majority, the militarists led here only a forlorn minority. The great mass of the young men and women who in the main formed the audience had done with mediævalism, and their faces were turned towards a new world. One sat among them amazed. For, truly, the overwhelming fact to record about a pacifist meeting held in Berlin University is that it was a pacifist meeting held in Berlin University.

It had been convened by the German Students' Pacifist League (*Deutscher pazifistischer Student-enbund*). The principal speaker was Professor Dr. Ludwig Quidde of Munich, a member of the National Assembly and an unswerving pacifist throughout the war (they refused to listen to him in Dresden even so recently as last autumn). He was advertised to speak on "Are we Pacifists merely Utopians?" For a full hour he dealt with the history of war, traveling from the primitive man with a club in his hand down to the Prussian officer of 1914. Having reached the World War, he began to get into his stride, and his denunciations of war were received with spontaneous outbursts of approval that were even more significant than the remarks that provoked them. When he denied that war led to the survival of the fittest, instancing his gray hairs as evidence to the contrary, Youth in the hall responded to Youth in the speaker with a great wave of laughter. But all the rest of the time they sat serious and attentive; and if a cynic might have detected an unkind significance in their hearty reception of the theory that war does not even pay the conquerors in the long run, there was no doubt about the sincerity in the din of applause that broke out when the speaker maintained that Germany's sufferings today, attributed by some to the revolution, are directly the result of the war. There might be a militarist minority among the audience; but there was apparently no one who cared to raise a voice in defense of the old Junkerdom.

One is generally told in Germany today that

pacifism there is purely a political growth, and that the fierce reaction against clericalism is not tempered, as in some other countries, by a search for some simpler form of faith. If this assertion is true, the hearing given to the speaker who followed Professor Quidde—Pfarrer Bleier—was all the more remarkable. His treatment of his subject—"let the peace bells ring throughout all lands"—was almost completely spiritual and religious; and the few interruptions that occurred appeared to be rather anti-Jewish than hostile in any broadly religious sense. There was long and unanimous applause when he gave as an instance of true religion the work that the Quakers have done in Germany since the war ended.

The speeches were not, however, what one had come out to hear. Enlightening as these were, given at such a moment and in the heart of Prussian Germany, they were still less informing than the general attitude of the audience, even when the meeting turned into something of a "rag," and the young reactionary, who declared that "Pacifism is the last cry of a conquered and a despairing nation," was answered by the communist, who retorted that such opinions were "the last cry of dying capitalism." What was said was less informing, too, than the personality of the Chairman, a student in officer's uniform, with a maimed arm and an Iron Cross; and very much less informing than the presence in the hall of members of the Peace League of Ex-Service Men (*Friedensbund der Kriegsteilnehmer*), who, some of them limping, many of them with artificial features and other grim signs of what war had meant to them, sat among the audience, or went about distributing their leaflets and their journal, *Der Friedensbund*. It would be hard to find a more stirring appeal to the higher Internationalism than is contained in the manifesto of this League. Here are two of its articles:—

"1. The aim of the League is the popularization and ceaseless presentation of ideas of peace and reconciliation. Founded by the millions who have felt the horror and the curse of war more deeply than any other men, it will set up a wall against which any fresh recurrence of violence, and hatred must dash itself to pieces.

"2. A yearly conference of Ex-Service men (*Kriegsteilnehmer*) shall be convened, which shall make known throughout the country and the whole world the will of the soldiers of the Peoples' War. The League will support all similar manifestations of Ex-Service men in foreign countries, and will aim to bring about concerted international action."

*THE WORLD TOMORROW is indebted for this article to the American Friends' Service Committee.

Even bearing in mind the fact that one Pacifist League does not make a Pacifist University, nor one pacifist meeting a world peace, it was impossible to read such a manifesto, sitting among Prussian

students in a Prussian University, without feeling more than ever that one was living through a satire that might have been written about Berlin four years ago, as an ironic jest.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

An Answer to "The Pew vs. the Pillow"

MR. BOHN'S article in your May issue is an indictment as well as a challenge. Be assured that it made us feel pretty humble! The story of the sermon on "The Evolution of Humanity" that got tangled up with a minor prophet had a barb. I confess after going through it carefully to being discouraged—it is an all too true picture. Then came Dr. Bliss's article, "The Modern Missionary," in the current *Atlantic*. To my mind this meets the challenge, although in no sense quashing the indictment or absolving us from our sins. Mr. Bohn speaks of a seminary as "that backwash of higher education," while Dr. Bliss instances a certain institution "with its outlook wide as truth, with its sympathy for all religious aspiration." Again *THE WORLD TOMORROW* article says "the church is supported to represent a purpose and a doctrine in which the people of our time have lost interest," yet in "The Modern Missionary," the Christian Ideal—the basis of all forms and organizations of religion—is reinterpreted as "the best means of fitting a man to play a worthy part in the great drama of life." "Our people want life and want it abundantly," declares Mr. Bohn, and the answer from the college in Syria is: "Christ's religion is a world religion because it deals with a craving elemental, instinctive, universal—man's craving for life." The two articles appear at first sight wide apart (as far as New York is from Beirut), but there is a common source. I feel that they are to be read together. They represent the actual and the ideal, and yet that ideal has been lived out in a very practical manner and has made the author lay down his life as a sacrifice for his faith and work. The picture of our imperfections and shortcomings is well done and is needed, but so is the restatement of the Christian Ideal glowing with the magnetism of a devoted life.

HENRY B. HOWE.

The Outward Shell of Godliness

IF I may be permitted a voice in the discussion of current issues to which you kindly give space in your columns, I would like to ask if there is any better way to work for the salvation of society than by that way which seeks the regeneration of the individual.

The question was prompted by the contributions in your May issue on "The Pew versus the Pillow," and the need of a Christian International. The Socialist International proved a failure in the world crisis of 1914; and the Church is proving no less a failure in just so far as it is under the leadership of preachers who do not believe what they preach.

Was there ever a time before when world conditions furnished so much food for sober, serious thought? Or ever a time when the people were doing so little sober thinking?

Most people seem to think they are living in a world which somehow will always keep itself right side up; that the ship of state on which they are sailing is non-sinkable; that if there are things that concern them of more serious import than money-chasing, amusements, and an orgy of spending, they will take care of themselves or George will do it.

They seem oblivious to the fact that whatever kind of goal their country or the world is hastening to, it will certainly take them along with it.

And everywhere the effort is being made to remedy the situation by some kind of organization. It is the day of unions, combines and federations. But if I read history and Scripture aright, a political, an industrial or a religious combine or federation will be just about as effective in saving society from the down grade as the numerous peace societies were in preserving world peace in 1914.

When I was young I was taught that Christians—those who were really such—were the salt of the earth. Have we all today lost faith in these words of Christ? If we have, they may still be true, nevertheless.

Unions and federations furnish power, but not power of the right kind. Speaking to His followers, His church, Christ said: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth; go ye therefore," etc. That is enough power, certainly, but the church today has only the form of godliness, without the power.

The church ought to have a clear, ringing message for the world in this great crisis of human history; but the church has lost her message. Her spokesmen are not giving what God has for the world at this time, and do not even believe what they do preach.

Meanwhile the Bible, in which the clergy should find the message for the times if they would search, has become almost an obsolete book to laity and clergy alike.

LEON A. SMITH.

Concerning Eugene V. Debs

I AM not a Socialist, but I am interested in Eugene V. Debs, who is now serving a ten-year sentence for violation of the Espionage Act. I am interested in him because I believe the American judiciary is in error in its judgment regarding him. There were scores of us who could not follow the Government in its war policy, and because we dared to dissent from governmental findings are we to be adjudged criminals? We have the right to commend or criticize the President, and certainly the Senate has exercised that right to its greatest gratification. We have the right to approve or disapprove a congressional action, for our Congress is made up of men like those we meet on the street every day—men of varied ideals—high, moderate and low. Eugene V. Debs expressed his convictions, tempered in not a single instance with the demands of

force. When Celsus upbraided the Christians as being undesirable citizens because of their unwillingness to participate in war, Origen answered him by affirming that if the heathen priests were required to abstain from staining their hands with the blood of their fellow men in order to offer sacrifices in their temples to their heathen gods, how much more careful should Christians, who are true priests of the true God, abstain from staining their hands with their brothers' blood in order to appear before the true God in worship and adoration! War has got to be abolished as well as the causes that lie back of war. The only cure is Jesus Christ. The Bishop of Oxford said in 1918: "Jesus both rejected and refused to associate Himself with the current patriotism of His nation and positively laid the basis of universalism in His dealings with mankind." The disciple of Jesus must not be afraid to follow Him in a society that has not yet accepted His principles.

Eugene V. Debs stands for one of the most powerful principles in human history when he stands against carrying ends by force and violence. I should like to see a movement started for securing the pardon of Mr. Debs, for America cannot afford to name him among her criminal class. He ought to be free in body as he is now free in mind. If the war is over are we to continue the war tactics in preparation for another war, or are we to seek other paths that will lead us away from the next generation's staining its hands with its brothers' blood? These are days for calm thinking in order to find our way out of the severe entrenchments which hinder our progress, for the world's heart is kinder than we are wont to think.

Christian Temple, Baltimore.

PETER AINSLEE.

The Old, Old Story

THE life of Eugene Victor Debs as written by David Karsner is an arresting human document. Everyone who has known anything at all about Debs has known that he was the kindest of men, free from self-seeking and devoted to what he conceived to be the interests of the working class.

But this book reveals qualities of a more significant character. He has a message to deliver which is wrought out of the inmost fibre of his being. And in his person and in the events of his life, this message is dramatized. He is more than a torch-bearer. He is a Torch.

As one reads his story, one catches the contagion of his pity, his indignation, and his abounding love. One burns with shame that while he has been in prison, we for whose sake he has worn stripes have been free. His life becomes symbolic, giving proof anew how eternally true is the Gospel story, how in each generation the Powers and Principalities and those in high places are at war with the indwelling God in man who would claim the earth as his own.

While Debs is the least self-regarding of men, he is possessed by a sort of sacrificial consciousness. His belief in the vicarious quality of his service was boldly proclaimed by him at his trial.

"Your Honor," he said, addressing the Court, "years ago recognized my kinship with all living beings, and I made up my mind that I was not one whit better than the meanest of the earth. I said then, I say now, that while there is a lower class, I am in it; while there is a criminal element, I am of it; while there is a soul in prison, I am not free. . . .

"I am the smallest part of this trial . . . what you may do with me will be of small consequence after all. I am not on trial here. There is an infinitely greater issue that is being tried in this court, though you may not be conscious of it. American institutions are on trial here before a court of American citizens. The future will tell. . . .

"Great issues are not decided by courts. . . . The court of final resort is the people, and that court will be heard from in due time. . . . Sixty years ago the Supreme Court affirmed the validity of the Fugitive Slave Law, to save chattel slavery. Five years later, that infamous institution was swept away in a torrent of blood. . . .

"All hail to the Workers of America and the World. The day of emancipation is dawning."

As Debs was being escorted to prison he was overheard saying to his guard: "Marshall—I should not wish you ever to feel that you have done me the slightest injury or harm by bringing me here. I understand perfectly well why I am going to prison, and I am glad for the reason that I am going here." And, records the biographer, "Debs' long arm slowly stretched across the broad shoulder of his guard, and in this fashion he entered the prison. . . ."

It is written among the stars in their courses that a phenomenal vote will be cast for Eugene Victor Debs next November upon Election Day. For from always it has been true that souls of supreme quality are magnified by persecution. "I, if I be lifted up shall draw all men unto me."

So it is that the thoughts and hopes of those who are reaching out for deliverance in a world that is sick from greed and war are turning to a Federal prisoner in Atlanta, Georgia, who is serving a ten years' sentence because he defended the "human mind unchained and the right of ungagged expression of opinion." Multitudes who heretofore have thought of Debs only as an obscure agitator are hailing him today as a champion of our outraged liberties and a standard-bearer of those who would build God's Kingdom upon earth.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS.

Boston, Mass.

A Worker Tells Why He Is A Socialist

EXPERIENCE in life as a working man who has tried to help a faithful worker and companion, and earn a reasonable support and home for a few children, has necessarily required serious thought. This is perhaps more or less common among those of no financial resources, who have taken their chance in like responsibility, and the difficulty of accomplishing this is the immediate or secondary cause of the world-wide unrest today.

The primary or first cause is of very different merits. In particular of recent years the struggle for existence has become very strenuous and is largely the cause of many becoming desperate. To contemplate a still greater proportion of humanity as shrewd and successful profiteers in the trade class, which is already entirely too large, certainly seems depressing to those who really belong to the producing class.

The desire for comfort, beauty, leisure, and the sweets of life is natural and Godly; so long as we are content with a share of such as could be common, or more so than now, and in accordance with our ability

to enjoy and appreciate the same; and until there is some more equal distribution of these real essentials to a life that is worth while there will be no industrial or social peace.

God is our life, and surely we are justified in claiming inheritance from God. Continual disturbances in the crisis of recent years impelled the writer, as many others, to research for the true cause of the deplorable condition we are really existing in today, even though we, the vast majority and foremost of humanity, profess faith in Jesus the Son of the God of Love and only eternal God.

And after considerable study of the life and real teaching of the great Galilean who disturbed the ruling element of his day, we are led to question the present understanding of Christ and God the Father.

All intelligent people must admit that God never intended the natural resources of the earth to be owned and controlled by a few, but are only given us to use for the benefit of humanity in common; that too great a share of these blessings is selfish; and that selfishness leads to desolation, misery, hell and death.

There seems to be quite a variety of opinion as to who, what, and where God is, or rather of the different Gods. There is but one eternal God; the God of love, the God of thoughtful and kindly men who wrote, "Love seeketh not its own"; and friendship and joy are the fruits of the spirit of love.

Thus we reason, and most certainly we need a far better understanding of who or what God really is in this as well as other nations. Some of us are entirely satisfied that it is friendship humanity is bleeding for rather than mastership. If it is mastership, it certainly needs a change.

Who dares say that Jesus was not social? It's the "Old, old, story of Jesus and His Love"; and His love is God; God is love.

Now since we quite profess, and sing, "What a friend we have in Jesus," it is up to each of us who are yet allowed to vote to prove our faith, to do our best to elect the Christ Spirit—common wealth instead of selfish wealth.

A LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEER.

German Women Appeal from the Way of Violence

THE inclosed appeals issued by some of our German women seem to me very touching and quite in line with the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

JANE ADDAMS.

Hull House, Chicago.

LISTEN to our appeal and our warning. The local Frankfort group of the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom in which women of twenty-one countries are united to work for the reconciliation of peoples, turns to you.

It is a question of meeting the fact of the occupation warily.

Mutual distrust and a blind flaring up of hate have already done grievous harm.

Women, give to the men and to the young people an example of deliberate self-restraint.

Work with your force as mothers against further bloodshed. Under present conditions thoughtlessness on the part of one individual is a serious danger to the whole community.

However much indignation you may feel over the oc-

cupation of a further part of our country, guard yourself against any expression of discontent. Consider and explain to your children that the individual soldier did not come here of his own ill will. He is under a control for which he cannot be held responsible.

Women of Frankfort, learn from the experience of these sad and historic days. Join us in working for the overthrow of the belief in force and for world democracy.

Fight with us for Peace and Freedom.

W. I. L. P. F.

Frankfort-on-Main.

From the German Section of the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom.

THE German Section of the W. I. L. P. F. demands emphatically and positively that the government of the country should abandon the policy that has been followed hitherto of violence against workers in the Ruhr district.

Through bitter experience we have become convinced that all violence and threats of violence call for further violence on the side of those who are threatened and that increases the confusion and makes the danger of bloodshed greater.

We women are tired of this policy of blood and weapons which has wasted and torn Germany, first in conflict with other peoples and then for a year in civil war.

The workers in the Ruhr district took up arms to protect the Government and the Constitution against military mutiny. The troops which have been sent against them are least of all entitled to exercise judgment and revenge upon them.

Peace and order can return only if these troops are recalled.

The last resources of the economic life of our people, already so deeply disorganized, are involved; resources that mean too much to us all for us to sacrifice them in order to satisfy the prestige of military ambition to which we have already sacrificed the well-being of our people, their morality and culture.

As the only escape from this situation, for the menacing development of which the government is not without blame, we must demand the immediate recall of all troops concentrated in the Rhenish zone of conflict and their return to their barracks and the laying down of their arms by the workers' troops in the Rhineland. To prevent future danger to national reconstruction from anti-constitutional militarism, it is essential that all officers and men who had the slightest sympathy for the military "Putsch" should be eliminated from the Reichswehr and other bodies of troops, that volunteers should be done away with, that a policy of violence at home or abroad should be thoroughly and permanently ended.

Liberal and just economic and legal policies which the Government has certainly not yet been able to inaugurate would without fail lead to quiet and good order and contentment on the part of all the better elements of the population, and these constitute the majority.

Violent measures, those from above, are the soil out of which the minority of trouble-makers, mutineers, and men of violence gain enough power to carry destruction to the very marrow of the state and the people.

Dawning Light on Russia

By ALBERT COYLE

Russian-American Relations, March, 1917-March, 1920. Documents and Papers Compiled and Edited by C. K. Cumming and Walter W. Pottit, under the direction of John A. Ryan, D. D., J. Henry Scattergood, and William Allen White, at the request of The League of Free Nations Association. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 376 pp.

"IF you know the worst thing that the Allies could possibly do in Russia," said the American Consul in Moscow shortly after the November Revolution, "you can depend upon it that that will be their next move." The compilation of documents recorded in this book amply proves the point. It is no mere figure of speech to call it a Russian tragedy in five acts. The documents it presents fall into five fairly well-defined periods of Russian policy: (1) our policy toward the Provisional Government; (2) toward the Bolshevik government up to the Brest-Litovsk treaty; (3) from Brest-Litovsk to armed Allied intervention; (4) intervention up to the Prinkipo Conference proposal by the Allied Council at Paris; and (5) thence to the action of the Supreme Council in February, 1920, partially lifting the blockade in order to promote trade with Russia. Through each of these acts of the drama run plots and counter-plots, the collision of unselfish and sometimes unwise idealism with war passions, secret diplomacy, and greedy imperialism. As in Dostoevski's *Brothers Karamazov*, the struggle between the forces of light and darkness blunders on with wavering success and failure; at the end nothing is really concluded; and we have the unsatisfied feeling that through it all we have been spectators merely of the symptoms, while deeper than the penetration of our present vision lie the forces which control the puppets on the platform.

The strength of the book lies in the fairness with which the documents have been collected. Unlike the numerous pink, white, blue, and yellow books compiled for propaganda purposes by various belligerent governments during the war, one has here an honest attempt to give all the important documentary evidence obtainable conditioning our relations with Russia. In this respect it is unquestionably the most valuable source-book yet published for him who seeks the unvarnished truth about Revolutionary Russia. But lest the guileless be deceived into believing that he can find here the sufficient key to American or Allied policy toward the Revolutionary Republic, it is needful to point out the inherent limitations of this compilation. In the first place, the documents that really reveal Allied aims and policies in Russia are still shrouded behind the skirts of secret diplomacy. For instance, when the Soviet Government was still willing to fight against Germany if given material assistance by the Allies, why did the latter withhold the supplies so imperatively needed, and instead permit their ally, Japan, to make that fateful "descent" on Vladivostok? Or why, again, did certain Allied representatives, while still accredited to the friendly Soviet Republic, which they themselves had declared to their governments to be the one power in Russia capable of preventing Germany

from overrunning the land, yet conspire with every possible leader of reaction to overthrow that government? The documents in this book would indicate that the paramount aim of American and Allied diplomacy was simply to keep Russia in the war against Germany. In all the interchange of diplomatic notes with the Soviet authorities, that is the one thing stressed as of imperative importance. But beneath the suave and superficial phrases of diplomacy, was there some secret purpose, deeper and more sinister than any revealed by these documents, which prompted the Allies to demand that Russia continue the war at the very moment that they made such participation impossible? We do not know. The chancelleries of Europe have not yet trusted us with their secret pacts and ententes. But some things we may surmise. What did Mr. Kerensky mean—the same Mr. Kerensky who, at Allied behest, strove to maintain the front against Germany by leading unarmed Russians to awful slaughter in the Gallian offensive of July, 1917,—when he asserted: "England and France already had agreed on the division of their spheres of influence in disintegrated Russia"? (United Press interview, December 11, 1918). What did Pichon mean when, in an excited moment, he declared in the French Chamber of Deputies in May, 1919, that the Allies had agreed to divide Russia into "zones of action"? What did Mr. Herbert Allen, director of four important Anglo-Russian petroleum companies, wish to imply when he said of Russia at the annual meeting of the Bibi Eihat Oil Company, Limited: "Never before in the history of these islands was there such an opportunity for the penetration of British influence and British trade, for the creation of a second India or a second Egypt; but the feeble voices of our politicians, under the heel of democracy, drown all such aspirations"? (*Petroleum World*, January, 1919).

We do not know what they meant, nor do these documents inform us.

In the second place, one can fairly say of these documents, as *Oliver Twist* complained of his porridge, "It's good as far as it goes, but there ought to be more." I do not refer to compacts still held secret, but to documents which the compilers should have had in hand, and which are of such importance that they should not have been ignored. The preface to the volume very candidly states that "this compilation is necessarily fragmentary and incomplete." Obviously, from a mass of material the compilers could select for publication only those documents which they deemed of greatest importance. Yet there are a number of extremely valuable documents which might well have been included in this list, even to the exclusion of some others. Such, for instance, are Chicherin's notes to our Consul at Moscow, Mr. D. C. Poole, of April 6, 25, and 26, 1918, concerning Allied support of the Anglo-Japanese seizure of Vladivostok and of counter-revolutionary elements in Siberia; his notes of June 12 and 14 protesting against the arbitrary seizure by the United States of four vessels in foreign ports belonging to the Russian Mercantile Marine, and against the continued violation of the neutral waters of Russia by

American men-of-war; Chicherin's pathetic appeal of July 7 to Ambassador Francis, "relying on the friendliness you and your government have always shown Russia," regarding the advance of the uninvited British forces, not toward the Finnish front where the Germans menaced, but in the opposite direction, into interior Russia, with violence en route. Nor is there mention of Chicherin's note to Poole of August 2 concerning the violation of confidences extended to an American representative, and apprising him of the bombardment of the islands covering Archangel by British warships (which provoked in Archangel the revolt of the natives "in order to welcome the English"). One of the most important documents that ever passed between our representative and the Soviet Government (Chicherin-Poole, August 5, 1918) is also unfortunately omitted. After assuring Poole that, despite Anglo-French armed aggression in the North, the Soviet Government is still at peace with America, and wants its representatives to remain in Russia, where they will be accorded every possible facility for communicating with their government ("the stoppage of telegraphic communication through Murmansk is the work of Britain and not ours"), he begs the American Consul to make the following facts known "to your Government as well as to the great masses of the people abroad":

"In the midst of peace the Anglo-French armed forces have made a violent irruption into our borders, taking by force our villages and our towns, shooting down the faithful responsible workers of the Soviets, disbanding the workers' organizations and throwing their members into prison or sending them away from their homes, with nothing to justify their acts of robbery. No declaration of war was made against us, and without a state of war being declared battles are being fought against us, and our national property is being robbed. Against us no right is recognized, no rule is upheld by those who have sent this force of invaders. Because we, the first in the world, have established a Government of the exploited and of the poor, against us pure banditism is considered permissible, and people who have not declared war upon us are operating among us like barbarians. . . . We see in you the representative of a people who, in your words, 'will not do anything against the Soviets.' . . . Can you not make it clear to us what Britain really wants from us? Is its aim to overthrow the most popular form of government that the world has seen, the Soviets of the Workers and the Poor? Is its aim counter-revolution? Or does it want a specific conquest, a definite town or some strip of land?"

While several important documents are given relating to the artificially stimulated Czecho-Slovak revolt, the most enlightening paper of all, Trotsky's official statement in the *Isvestia* for June 9, 1918, is not included in this collection. Finally, the removal of the Allied diplomatic corps to Vologda and its refusal to reside in Moscow despite the daily entreaties of the Soviet Government, is passed over with brief mention in a footnote, although the numerous notes passing between the parties show that it was the first definite

break of Allied diplomats with Soviet Russia, which the latter (despite Mr. Francis' statement) tried by every possible means to prevent. On July 25, while British troops were advancing on Archangel from Soroka and British warships were on their way to bombard its harbor, the Allied diplomatic corps, led by its dean, Ambassador Francis of the United States, departed for that city. The ostensible reason given therefor in Ambassador Francis' note to Chicherin of July 24, printed as of July 25 in this compilation, is that he was refused communication with his own Government. On the same day Chicherin fully answers this charge, showing that delay was due to causes wholly beyond the control of his government, and denying that it had ever issued orders restricting the rights of the diplomatic corps. This answer is not included in the compilation. The last official communication of the Soviet Government to the American ambassador (Chicherin-Francis, July 28, 1918) really should have found a place in the collection:—

"I take the opportunity of this last moment before your departure to express once more my profound regret and sorrow at the unfortunate circumstances that have had as result your present journey across the sea, and also my best thanks for your kindness and courtesy and for your good feelings towards the Russian popular masses, whose most adequate and faithful representatives are the Soviets, the councils of the Poor and of the Toiling. Please convey our affection and admiration in the messages you will send across the ocean to the great people of pioneers on the new continent and to the posterity of Cromwell's revolutionaries and of the heroes of the War of Independence."

The careful reader of these documents will regard them rightly as an appetizer rather than as the whole banquet. They raise more questions than they settle, and fill one with a wholesome curiosity to get at the underlying facts. Thus, why did the Stockholm Conference, called by the belligerent and neutral Socialists of Europe to end the equilibrium of slaughter after the Allied Council at Paris had failed to formulate definite war aims and a possible basis for peace, incur the strong disapproval of the Allies, including peace-loving America? What sort of dangerous program did it propose? The answer is not found in these documents, but in Captain Jacques Sadoul's *Notes sur la révolution bolchevique* (a book which by all means ought to be translated and made accessible to the American public). The Socialist leaders of France, Germany, Belgium, Austria, Holland, Russia, and the Scandinavian countries had agreed upon definite terms of peace which for fairness and justice put the Versailles treaty to shame. What if the Allies had not suppressed the Conference, and these acceptable terms had been spread broadcast in a war-weary world? Or take another case: these documents record the recognition by America of the "representative government" established by "the people of Finland," although previous documents in the collection show that it was set up by General Mannerheim, friend of "the noble Kaiser and mighty German people." Mannerheim overcame a peasants' and workers' soviet government only by the aid of German bayonets, and yet after Germany's defeat received the unqualified support of the Allies! And so

The Last Column

for a hundred other documents in this compilation: they will compel even a lazy man to do some serious thinking, and might lead him to ruminate in fields far beyond the scope of the documents concerned.

The League of Free Nations Association and the compilers are to be congratulated for their splendid service in securing and publishing these documents for the enlightenment of that new majority, the people, whose heart always beats right if its head has the facts. We trust that the Association will make good its promise to conduct similar excursions into other phases of our foreign policy. And we ardently hope that the Association will not be satisfied until, joined with other liberty-loving people, it puts an end to the sinuous dealings of secret diplomacy, by which the frontiers of oil and coal are advanced rather than the frontiers of freedom. Let us demand from our representatives the full truth about the commitments in which they have involved us without our knowledge and approbation. Let us call a stop forever to this gambling with the lives and the property of the people in pursuit of a policy born behind closed doors and nurtured in darkness. Until that is done, we can only guess as to what was the policy of America in Russia and the motives which prompted it. So long as such things continue there can be no League of Free Nations, because no nation can be truly free.

Notes About Books

THERE are on my desk a group of books on various aspects of social problems which we have not space to review at length, but which I desire most heartily to commend to our readers. The first is Richard Roberts' *The Unfinished Program of Democracy* (B. W. Huebsch.) Readers of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* do not need to be told of the value of anything Richard Roberts writes. This book is a mature statement of his social thought.

Arthur Gleason has performed a great service by his thorough-going study of British labor published under the head of *What the Workers Want* (Harcourt, Brace and Howe). Some of the chapters have already appeared in *THE WORLD TOMORROW* and other periodicals, but the book as a whole has a value much greater than that of its parts.

Perhaps more significant for the future than developments in Britain is the story of Russia. Evans Clark has written a little book called *Facts and Fabrications about Soviet Russia* (The Rand School, New York) which not only exposes the vicious anti-Soviet propaganda, but gives an admirable bibliography carefully arranged for the guidance of honest inquirers.

Finally, I should like to recommend the grim and terrible story of the Centralia conspiracy by Ralph Chaplin (*The Centralia Conspiracy*, By Ralph Chaplin.) Mr. Chaplin's sympathies are frankly with the I. W. W.'s, but his story is calmly told and its power comes from its statement of facts; first, about the ruthlessness of the lumber companies who, having monopolized the timber that belongs to the people, tolerate no opposition to their control; and secondly, about one of the most terrible of the tragedies which have stained the record of the American labor struggle with blood.

N. T.

I KNOW it is very easy these days to think hard things about landlords, but I have just heard a story—a perfectly true story—which is calculated to soften the heart of an evicted tenant sitting on the sidewalk in the rain with all his household goods around him. It appears that a certain worthy citizen of Cincinnati had spent two weary months looking for an apartment from which children were not barred and for which the rent was not prohibitive. But he sought in vain. At last he decided to put the following advertisement in one of the local papers:

"A young couple with two precious gifts of God wish to rent a 3- or 4-room flat. References furnished.—G. S. L., etc."

That touching appeal worked a miracle. In less than forty-eight hours Cincinnati landlords had communicated with Mr. Long each saying in effect: "You're welcome to take my apartment. I don't mind the children." Which surely reflects great credit on Cincinnati, and shows that even a landlord's heart can throb with the best of them.

I WONDER how many readers of this page have heard of the answer which Major C. R. Attlee, the Mayor of Stepney, one of the principal working-class boroughs of London, sent to Lord Fisher the other day, when the latter asked him to assist in recruiting new men for the British army. Of course this is not the kind of news about England which our newspapers think fit to print, but it seems to me that in this letter of the Mayor of Stepney are some of the truest and bravest words that ever blotted paper:

"In reply to your letter inviting my assistance in recruiting for the Territorial Force, I am not prepared to do anything in the matter.

"After four and a half years' active service, I have seen every ideal for which I fought betrayed at the Paris Conference, and I am not prepared to ask men to take up the responsibility for Home Defense without some better guarantee than the words of the present Government that they will not be used for aggressive and filibustering expeditions abroad."

CONSIDERING that a short time ago so many people were consumed with a burning desire to lend a hand in the hanging, drawing, and quartering of the former Emperor of Germany, it is not a little surprising that the following brief colloquy, which took place in the British House of Commons the other day, attracted so little attention. Mr. Horatio Bottomley, the great British super-patriot, rose in his place and demanded of the Prime Minister just exactly when the Kaiser was to be brought to trial. Mr. Lloyd George actually had the temerity to say by way of reply that to impeach the ex-Kaiser would be a futile proceeding. What followed must be told in the simple words of the official record of the proceedings of Parliament.

"Mr. Bottomley: 'Why would it be futile?'"

"The Prime Minister: 'Because it would be.'"

To make matters worse the report states that Mr. George's reply was received with "laughter." Can such things be?

THE PROOFREADER

THE LABOR FILM SERVICE, Inc.

has a mission to perform, an ideal to achieve

Can you afford to stand aside?

Endorsed by the Central Federated Union of New York, representing 500,000 Workers.

DIRECTORATE

THOMAS B. HEALY
Pres. Marine Workers' Amalgam
DARWIN J. MESEROLE
Publicist
I. M. SACKIN
Attorney
DR. ISAAC GROSSMAN
Physician
JOSEPH D. CANNON
Field Director
HERMAN ROSS
Business Manager



ORGANIZATION

Capitalized for \$50,000.
To be increased to \$250,000.
Stock \$10.00 per share.
No preferred stock.

51% of the stock to be in control of unions. This to prevent any small group from getting control.

THE LABOR FILM SERVICE, Inc.,

31 Union Square, New York

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

Help us wage this fight for truth

READ THIS

THE BEST WAY TO TELL THE TRUTH IS TO HUMOROUSLY FALSEHOOD.

To all folks who have a sense of humor and can appreciate the absurdities of the present social and economic system, don't miss an issue of:



Edited by Art Young

"TO LAUGH THAT WE MAY NOT WEEP"

Out the 1st and 15th of each month. **GOOD MORNING** is the most fearless, hard hitting pictorial magazine of humor and satire published in America.

GOOD MORNING is not filled with heavy and tiresome reading, but with clever cartoons, bits of verse and brilliant epigrams. You'll want it and will be out of sorts if you don't get it; so fill out the coupon and mail in your subscription today. \$3.50 per year—\$1.00 for three months.

Good Morning Co., Inc., 7 E. 15th St., N. Y. City.
Enclosed please find..... for which send **GOOD MORNING** to

Name.....

Address.....

State.....

T. F. Hastings, Business Manager

THE CENTRALIA CONSPIRACY

By RALPH CHAPLIN

Only the Lumber Trust version of the Centralia affair was permitted to reach the public. The newspapers said that unoffending paraders were killed without provocation or excuse by ambushed I. W. W.'s. Do you believe it?

This remarkable booklet contains an accurate and complete story of the whole affair. It reveals startling facts—suppressed facts—facts that you were never intended to hear. Read about the tremendous and bitter struggle of the Western lumberjacks against the Lumber Trust for better conditions.

For sale through

THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT

Price 50 cents

A Correction

By an error which we regret, in our last issue, Harcourt, Brace and Howe were named as publishers of Gilbert Murray's, *Our Great War and the War of the Ancient Greeks*. The book should be credited to Thomas Seitzer.

The Child Today Will Build The World Tomorrow

Dear Reader of THE WORLD TOMORROW:—

What kind of a world is he going to build? Suppose I were to tell you that \$1.00 from each of you who read this page would mean a real school and health program within the reach of every child in one state and give him enough childhood so that when he goes to work he can go open-eyed and efficient. Wouldn't you buy? It is a fact. We can prove it. Last year the Census found 153,000 working children in Alabama out of school. This year the legislature created a Child Welfare Department to see that every child in the state has a fair chance; passed a good compulsory school-attendance law; a real child labor law; provided juvenile court machinery for every county, and substantially increased the facilities of the State Department of Health. Why did they do it? Ask the Governor or the Director of the Child Welfare Department.

Appeals from other states to do the same kind of work are on my desk today. We can't do it unless you send us the money. Can you find any place where a dollar will go farther?

Every state needs to know where its children are, what they are doing and what is happening to them, and then to provide what they need. But to put these constructive measures through we must be backed by those who see that the world can be built only by vigorous, virtuous, intelligent humans. If you are with us, put your name and address on this coupon, pin a dollar bill to it or write a check and mail today.

Sincerely yours,

OWEN R. LOVEJOY.

**This page is provided by a friend who believes that
The World Tomorrow depends on The Child Today**

National Child Labor Committee,

Officers:

Felix Adler, Chairman

Homer Folks, } Vice-

Samuel M. Lindsay } Chairmen

V. Everit Macy, Treasurer

Owen R. Lovejoy, Gen. Sec.

National Child Labor Committee

105 East 22nd Street, New York City

Enclosed is my dollar to help The Child Today build The World Tomorrow.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Articles on

India	M. K. Gandhi
Russia	Norman Thomas
Ireland	Esther Phillips
Switzerland	H. Emil Brunner
Allen vs. Howat	Benjamin Stolberg
Paterson	Evan Thomas
Militarism	Charles T. Hallinan
Industrial Democracy	James Meyers
The Railroads—Editorial	

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents for the September Issue.

	Page.
Reflections on Russia and Revolution. By Norman Thomas.....	250
Signs of the Times.....	263
The Law of Suffering. By M. K. Gandhi.....	266
Races, Cars and Men.....	267
From Ireland. By Katharine Whitmarsh Phillips.....	269
Alien vs. Hovell. By Benjamin Stolberg.....	270
Voices From the Wilderness.....	274
Disillusion and Hope in Switzerland. By H. Emil Brunner.....	276
Glories of Our Blood and State. By Genevieve Taggard.....	277
Pateron Points a Moral. By Evan Thomas.....	278
An Appraisal of Industrial Democracy. By James Meyers.....	279
100 Per Cent. Academic. By Ruth McIntire.....	281
Out Where You Live—An Appeal. By Charles H. Hallinan.....	282
Open for Discussion.....	283
Ex Libris.....	286

The World Tomorrow

Vol. 111. September, 1920. No. 9.

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
116 East 29th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevins Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gova Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Mullah, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.75. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 116 East 29th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1913, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

M. K. GANDHI is that remarkable Hindn patriot and pacifist whose character and services were described by Gilbert Murray in "The Soul as It Is" (Hibbert Journal, January, 1918).

ESTHER WHITMARSH PHILLIPS has already found appreciative readers for her verse. She and her husband are studying conditions in Great Britain and Ireland, and she is acting as correspondent for The World Tomorrow.

BENJAMIN STOLBERG has taught sociology in the University of Oklahoma and later was in charge of the Red Cross Training Institute of the University of Kansas. While there he studied the Industrial court. He is now a book reviewer for the Chicago Tribune.

H. EMIL BRUNNER is a talented young Swiss pastor (and Socialist) who did post-graduate work in the United States last winter.

GENEVIEVE TAGGARD is already known for her verse.

EVAN THOMAS is Secretary of the Amalgamated Textile Workers at Paterson, N. J.

JAMES MEYERS is Executive Secretary of the Board of Operatives of the Dutchess Bleachery, Inc.

RUTH MCINTIRE, during her connection with the Child Labor Committee, specialized in educational problems.

CHARLES T. HALLINAN is Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism.

When People Get Back From Vacations

In the Fall is the time to push circulation. This Fall, too, it will be just before a national election, with interest in political and social questions at white heat.

Therefore we especially want you to help us in increasing the circulation of THE WORLD TOMORROW next month—October. It's a simple matter for you. Just decide which of your friends you think might subscribe. Then write as how many extra copies of THE WORLD TOMORROW you want for personal distribution to these friends. We will send you the copies free of charge. And we shall try to make the October issue especially suitable for this purpose. Of course, we still want the names of interested persons to whom we can send copies from our office. But your personal touch counts.

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Prices of these books are subject to change by the publisher.	
Darkwater. W. A. B. DuBois (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00
The Rising Tide of Color. Lothrop Stoddard (Scribner).....	3.00
Our Great War and the Great War of the Ancient Greeks. Gilbert Murray (Thomas Seltszer).....	1.25
Bolshevism at Work. W. T. Gooda (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
The Russian Republic. Colonel Malota (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
"Barbarous" Soviet Russia. Isaac McBride (Thomas Seltszer).....	2.50
The Unfinished Program of Democracy. Richard Roberts (B. W. Huebsch).....	2.00
What the Workers Want. Arthur Gisson (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	4.00
Facts and Fabrications About Russia. Evans Clark (Rand School, N. Y.).....	.50
The Centella Conspiracy. Ralph Chaplin.....	.50
Useful Wild Plants. Charles Francis Saunders (McBride).....	\$3.50
Maureen. Patrick MacGill (McBride).....	2.00
Life of General William Booth. Harold Begbie (Macmillan).....	10.50
New It Can Be Told. Philip Gibbs (Harper).....	3.00
The Judgment of Peace. A. Lasko (Boal & Liveright).....	1.75
The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan).....	3.00
The Bishop and Other Stories. Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
The Chorus Girl and Other Stories. Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
A Short History of the American Labor Movement. Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
New Ventures of Faith, edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press). Paper, loc.; boards.....	.60
National Ideals in the Old Testament. Henry Cabot (Scribner).....	1.75
The Shadow. Mary White Ovington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00
Ultimate Papers. Randolph Bourne (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.50
The Social Problem. Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan).....	1.75
Man or the State. Edited by Waldo R. Brown (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.25
The Grail of Life. John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.).....	2.00

THE WORLD TOMORROW STILL NEEDS \$1,000 FOR ITS GUARANTEE FUND FOR THE CURRENT YEAR

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 9

SEPTEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Reflections on Russia and Revolution

By NORMAN THOMAS

THE territory over which the Poles and Russians fight is scarred with battle and devastated by famine and typhus. Yet as I write comes news that the Poles having defeated the Russian armies on Polish soil, reject all peace proposals and still talk of enlarged boundaries and buffer states. Such is the terrible madness of Polish chauvinism and the French imperialism of which it is the tool. The Russian terms so summarily rejected are in the main just or even generous. The possible exception is the obscure clause about a militia of the workers. Russia has a right to secure protection against fresh aggression from the Polish junkers, but if under this clause she hopes to force a Soviet government on an unwilling Poland, she goes beyond the bounds of justice. But this is uncertain and in any event it is sanctioning hypocrisy for the Allied diplomats to raise hands of holy horror when the Soviets copy their own evil policy of imposing the sort of government they want when they have the power. Bad as things are there is still hope for peace. Apparently the Allies and America are outwardly united in warning the Poles against new invasion of Russia. They probably know that the Russian armies are far from utter defeat and in the long run will be victorious over Poland to which they themselves can scarcely do more than lend generals and supplies. The truth is that the Allies are no longer really united and all of them in some degree fear the power of Labor. Lloyd George is dependable but the magnificent stand of British Labor added to his troubles in Ireland, Mesopotamia, and his Asian empire in general will probably counterbalance the influence of Winston Churchill. No class in Italy wants war. Our own government has learned nothing about Russia since 1918, but despite its virtual gifts to Poland, is only pro-Polish while the Poles are on their own soil. France can hardly go it alone. In this and Lenin's desire for peace lies hope of avoiding new world war.

Whatever the future has in store, the revival of Russian power remains one of the miracles of modern history. At the beginning of 1918 her armies were hopelessly defeated and disorganized. Her

people desired peace at any price. Revolution following hard upon the heels of the gross inefficiency of the Tsar's government brought her affairs to confusion and chaos. It is doubtful whether the Bolshevik leaders themselves had much confidence in their ability to hold the power they won late in 1917. They were forced to make the peace of Brest-Litovsk by internal conditions and by the stupid failure of the Allies to recognize the facts and to deal with them wisely. From that moment until this the Soviet government has had to struggle against foreign enemies and internal foes, against blockade and consequent hunger and disease, against industrial disorganization and the conflict of interest between peasants and city workers, and finally, but by no means least, against the bitter and envenomed lies of their enemies spread to all quarters of the globe. In spite of these things they have beaten back their enemies, practically recovered—with the consent of the people—all Asian territory once held by the Tsar, organized out of chaos a government which is now being criticised not as anarchistic, but as too rigorous.

More than this, Bolshevik Russia has become a symbol of hope, a presage of the dawn to millions and millions of the exploited of all races and colors in practically every land washed by the seven seas. In the face of these facts, the illusion still persists in many minds that this miracle was accomplished solely by the power of ruthless and unscrupulous tyranny, by atrocities and perfidy. The charge is obviously absurd. Communist party members in Russia doubtless are a small minority of the people, but it is inconceivable that in the face of well-nigh insuperable obstacles they could have organized a great and efficient army unless they had at least the passive support of the people. The Russians must at the worst have preferred Bolshevik rule to any immediately available substitute. Amid many uncertainties this conclusion is certain. It is equally apparent that the Allied and American policy toward Russia has been both stupid and criminal. If Bolshevism has become militarized or if the old Russian imperialistic spirit has to some degree been reawakened, the Allies have themselves

to blame. Their attitude toward Russia has been, if anything, more dishonorable than open war. They could not send great armies of their own weary citizens against Russia, but they could and did subsidize impartially and indiscriminately Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenitch, Wrangel, the Czecho-Slovaks, Estonians, Ukrainians, Letts, Poles, and gave Japan virtually a free hand in the Far East. It was not the fault of the Allies that the Czecho-Slovaks had their eyes opened to the truth and refused any longer to fight the Soviets; that Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians at various stages made honorable and friendly peace with Russia; that Kolchak, Denikin, and Yudenitch were hopelessly defeated; that only the Japanese, the Poles, and General Wrangel are left. The Poles despite their rally on their own soil, must soon make peace, and Wrangel, despite French recognition, has far less chance than Denikin. In the Far East the Japanese play their own game, which is not that of the Allies. The Allies starved millions of Russian women and children or permitted them to perish from disease for lack of medical supplies. They played upon the greed and hate of the peoples of Central Europe. They sacrificed the lives of simple peasants upon the altar of western imperialism, with what result is now apparent to all the world. It cannot be made too clear that the primary responsibility for the misery and violent discontent to be found in varying degree throughout Europe and Asia, for the tragedies of the past and those that may be yet to come, rest upon Allied capitalistic-imperialism. Our own country cannot escape her share of the guilt.

But this condemnation of the sins of the western capitalist states does not relieve us from the necessity of trying as best we may to appraise both the good and evil, the success and the failure of communist theory and practice in Russia. Hence the profound significance of every honest report that comes out of that land. The most widely discussed of all recent reports is, of course, Bertrand Russell's. Mr. Russell is a rarely disinterested and acute observer, a pacifist, an anti-imperialist, and a socialist. One cannot but examine his opinion with respect. For my part, there are only two points on which I should like to raise some question. First, I doubt whether Mr. Russell has given due credit to the constructive achievements of the Soviet government in the care of children or the extension of education. According to impartial visitors to Russia, the achievements in these fields are amazing when one considers the difficulties against which the Russian Government had to contend. Mr. Russell himself made an important correction to his article in a letter to the *London Nation* of July 24th. He writes:

"Inadvertently the last sentence of my article last week gave an impression which I did not intend, namely, that the Soviet Government is indifferent or hostile to art. This is not the case; it is more friendly to art than our own Government. What I meant to suggest was that the mental atmosphere is one in which it is

difficult for art to flourish, but I did not mean that artists are ill-treated."

Might he not make a similar statement to bring out the achievement of the Soviets in regard to education and the care of children if his attention were called to the matter?

Secondly, Mr. Russell acknowledges his entire agreement with the socialist indictment of our capitalist civilization. He is unusually free from the bias of race or class. But after all, even though his pacifism cost him a short imprisonment in England, his life has been spent for the most part as a member of a favored class and of a dominant race. Suppose he himself had been one of the exploited workers, or a member of an oppressed race—might not his article have had a different emphasis? If, for example, a pacifist and a thinker of the type of M. K. Gandhi, the Hindu patriot, were to visit Russia, might he not give higher place than has Mr. Russell to the communist protest against imperialism and its recognition of the brotherhood of men of all races?

Outside these two points, much of the criticism of Mr. Russell's articles on the part of radicals is scarcely fair. It ignores his statement that if he himself were in Russia he would support the Soviet Government and that Russian conditions have probably made necessary the development of both the military and the autocratic features of the Soviet Government. It overlooks his tribute to the general efficiency of that government and its ability to preserve order, and his criticism of the Allies. Mr. Russell specifically praises the success of the Bolsheviks in obtaining the services of competent men in industry who work not for personal profit or the amassing of wealth, but for success and power. This goes a long way toward disposing of the theory that we cannot have industrial development without practically unlimited profits and is an enormously valuable achievement.

The significant criticisms of the Soviet Government in Russia, both in Mr. Russell's article and from other sources, seem to me to fall under three heads:

First, the Communists have not solved the conflict in interest between town and country. It must never be forgotten when men talk of the proletarian dictatorship that Lenin bought his dictatorial powers at a great price when he gave the land to the peasants practically on their own terms. Peasant proprietorship or even the ancient *Mir* system in Russia is very far from the communist ideal; yet Lenin with all his dictatorial powers has been obliged to fall back upon the slow methods of propaganda and education to train the peasants to think in terms of the social good. This conflict in interest between town and country is not peculiar to Russia. It is general throughout Central Europe. It is the rock upon which any form of the socialized industrial state may break. And those who rejoice in the "sturdy opposition of the peasants" to Bolshevism

might profitably consider Mr. Brailsford's essay, "Rural Europe Comes To Power" (*New Republic*, August 18th). Thus he concludes:

"At the end of a generation, the civilization of Central Europe may be predominantly agrarian, instead of urban. Foreign trade will still be, what it is today, nearly negligible, and each green plain, governed by its own Junkers, peasants, and clergy, will feed itself and produce a surplus barely sufficient for the millions of hungry miners and weavers. One doubts whether much will be left over for the professors and the scientists, the philosopher and the musicians—save, perhaps, for the few who have the wisdom to take orders. A greener Europe, calmer, duller and less populous, will sit down (if it has any mental life at all) to revise the essay on population which Malthus wrote during the last universal war."

Secondly, there can be small doubt that the communists in general look to armed revolution throughout the world as the only method of victory. This is apparently the doctrine of the Third International, whose rather dictatorial leaders are also the leaders of Soviet Russia. It is a somewhat puzzling fact that in the latter capacity they have shown an honest desire for peace with their neighbors and a willingness to make it on generous terms. Lenin is enough of a statesman to know that Russia must have peace if he is to work out his constructive plans. Perhaps if the Allies would start to deal fairly with Russia the enthusiasm of the Third International for war would somewhat abate. At any rate, if the Communists are right that civil war in every country is the only way to further the revolution, the future is dark. The voice of common sense if always assuring the man who opposes war that without military power right can never triumph. For this reason, sincere idealists bade us fight Germany with all the deadly weapons of modern war. In like manner and with like weapons sincere internationalists bid us overthrow capitalism. But however cogent the arguments for "force without stint or limit" to defend the right, the ultimate victory of humanity will never be won by war. It is certain that no conceivable gain from the defeat of Germany was worth the cost of the world war. One imperialism was substituted for another. It is doubtful whether any change in the social order can compensate humanity for worldwide military revolution and civil war whose consequences would be general chaos and misery, the victory of a militant capitalism or of a militarized socialism. Simply from the standpoint of biology and eugenics the racial cost of such a struggle would be stupendously disastrous. Grant that it is both unfair and absurd to criticise the Bolsheviks for defending their revolution from unscrupulous attacks by force of arms: it is neither unfair nor absurd to point out that unless mankind has the power and the ingenuity to find some way of revolutionizing the social order without universal war we will win no Utopia, establish on earth no city of God. It is disheartening that so many devoted revolutionists who so clearly see the crimes, the oppressions, and the follies of our present social order will

not even consider the value to the working class and to humanity of perfecting non-military methods for winning the victories of the cooperative commonwealth.

Thirdly, the final criticism of the Bolsheviks has to do with the famous "dictatorship of the proletariat," which in Russia has meant the dictatorship of the Communist party, maintained when necessary by force and the denial of free speech and free press not merely to the bourgeoisie but on occasion to their political opponents among the proletarians. The Russian experience proves what all human nature teaches, that since life must go on some strong party inevitably must step in and secure order and discipline in industry. Unless men can learn to work together intelligently, bound together by a high sense of fellowship, they will be forced to work together under iron discipline. This is particularly true in this modern age of machinery. In the case of Russia the ruthless attacks of counter-revolutionaries and foreign enemies also made a dictatorship virtually inevitable and fairly acceptable to the people. But the dangers of this sort of dictatorship are simply incalculable. Lenin in his brilliant pamphlet, *The State and Revolution*, written before he came to power, argues that if capitalism is overthrown by the dictatorship of the proletariat the state will ultimately wither away as people become accustomed to observe the rules of social life "without force, without constraint, without subjection, without the special apparatus for compulsion which is called the State"—that is, both the dictatorship and the State itself are for the transitional period only. This ideal of a temporary dictatorship leading to freedom is of course far nobler than the capitalist ideal of a permanent dictatorship of dominant races and classes. The trouble is, Lenin's economics are sounder than his psychology. Men covet not only wealth but power. Bureaucrats will not yield without a struggle, nor is conscription a sure and safe guide to freedom. If Russia peacefully and easily grows out of the dictatorship it will be an event more remarkable than the revolution itself. The present dictators of Russia, Mr. Russell tells us, are for the most part men of unusual ability, singularly disinterested in their loyalty to a great cause. Yet he argues that even if one could be sure of a continuance of disinterested dictatorship, it is probable that with the passing of the present crisis there may be the same kind of reaction that put the Stuart Kings back on the throne following the dictatorship of Cromwell and the Puritans. But it is a virtual certainty that no dictatorship will remain on a high level, or will voluntarily give place to freedom. It is conceivable that a nation might get rid of private capital and secure a fairly efficient industrialism and a high standard of general comfort under a dictatorship so despotic, tyrannous, and hateful as to make men willing to smash it even at the cost of giving anarchy or reaction a

chance. The dictatorship of the proletariat may be the obvious answer to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but it is a dangerous answer.

It is easy to see why men in Russia and in other lands justify the Russian dictatorship on the ground of necessity, and condone its drastic measures in the light of its achievements. But it is difficult to see why so many radicals pass from this kind of justification of a bitter and dangerous necessity to a glorification of it. There is a deal of inconsistency in the position of some of our own radicals. The other night at a certain labor gathering before the meeting was called to order the radical members were cursing Russell as a bourgeois and a philosopher—apparently unmindful of the fact that most of the Russian commissars were also bourgeois and some of them philosophers! As soon as the meeting was called to order these same radicals proceeded to score the dictatorship of their own officials and to argue for the necessity of government by the rank and file.

The fact is that while the desire for freedom is ineradicable most men desire it only for themselves. Upon society they wish to bestow not freedom, but "The Truth." Catholics, Protestants, conservatives, radicals, down through the ages have worked earnestly for liberty when they were among the oppressed. Once in power they usually sought to impose their own point of view for the glory of God or the salvation of mankind. We are faced by a curious dilemma. To be socially effective one must believe in something and believe in it hard. The reformer or revolutionist in any sphere is usually intolerant, concerned with truth not liberty, mankind not men. The tolerant man is too often liberal simply because, like Gallio, he "cares for none of these things." Yet no worthy or satisfactory social order will ever be achieved until men have learned to combine freedom with fellowship, until they have mastered the art of intelligent cooperation in which indeed the good of each is the good of all. Then they may come to the saving faith that Truth can win its own victories in the hearts of men. In no country more than in America is it necessary that these things should be said. It is exceedingly unlikely that the exact course of the Bolshevik revolution will be reproduced in this country now or in the future. But strong as is capitalism here it is not immune from the diseases which had overtaken it in Europe. Already we have industrial conflicts with us in a virulent form. Men have fought as violently and less idealistically in the United States over hours, wages, recognition of unions than in some European countries over the transformation of the social system. The class conflict here is complicated by racial conflicts. We have grown so accustomed to such events as the Duluth lynching and the infamous attack upon the Italian workers of West Frankfort, Illinois, that we scarcely notice them in the day's news.

America, therefore, has peculiar reason to take

to heart every lesson she can learn from the Russian experiment. The first and clearest lesson is that violence begets violence; that the attempt to crush the Russian revolution by force only made that revolution militant. Only after peace has been made with Russia can we properly learn what to avoid and what to imitate in the great Russian experiment in which are embodied so many high hopes and which has been served with such unselfish zeal.

From Khaki to Prison Gray

(From *The Sing Sing Bulletin*, June, 1920.)

THE records of Sing Sing prison show that one hundred and seventy-six of the twelve hundred inmates now within its walls served with Pershing's army in the world war. Few of them have ever been in prison before.

Ask these men how they got there and their replies are mostly alike. They come from almost every walk in life. They were honest and respectable before they gave up civil employment to put on the khaki uniform of an American soldier.

They explain what they have come to by telling of the reckless ways they drifted into when they got into bad company. It was the first time that many of them had been away from home, away from the refining influences of good women. They were like wild colts that had broken out of pasture. They do not blame their commanding officers. Every possible effort was undoubtedly made to safeguard the morals of the men, but even the most vigilant commanding officer couldn't be watching all that they did, particularly while on leave of absence.

Many who had been decent all their young lives fell into bad habits. They learned to drink and to gamble, and these led to other vices. Evils that they didn't know they were taught by evil associates. They did things they would never have dreamed of doing back in their home towns. The vice and gaieties of Parisian life opened the way. It was so easy to give up to such things when there was so much of it opened to their inexperienced eyes.

When the Armistice was declared and they were returned to their native land, many had grown so reckless that they had little desire to go back to their homes. The glamor of the bright lights of the New York cabarets kept them in the Big City until their money was squandered.

Some of the young men who are now felons in gray were awarded medals for heroic deeds of self-sacrifice on battlefields and in trench fights. Character and courage and self-sacrifice made of them heroes, but lax discipline and the brutalizing effect of savage warfare converted them into criminals. They went valiantly "over the top" and plunged headlong into a pit.

A hero medal is of little value to a man in prison.

Signs of the Times

A Political Extravaganza

THERE is often more wisdom in the baseball page of the New York *Tribune* than in its editorial columns. Witness Grantland Rice's declaration apropos of Babe Ruth's home-run carnival: "What his final mark will be is interesting more people than the number of electoral votes Harding or Cox will get." Why not? To make a world record really matters. Whether Harding or Cox is elected, the government will bungle along in much the same way, and all important questions will be decided in the next Congress as in the last by a strictly nonpartisan vote, controlled by business interests tempered by politics. Nevertheless, there is fun in the present campaign. Witness the resounding rhetoric of the leading candidates and their skill in evading all important issues. Harding is for a generous amnesty, but doesn't know anything in particular about the Debs case. He is not in favor of the administration's foreign policy, but does not know enough to give an opinion on Poland. If Cox has any opinion on these questions he "dasn't tell." Or consider the strange bed-fellows politics makes. Samuel Gompers and the New York *Times* support Cox, while those twin souls, Boise Penrose and Colonel Robins, cheer for Harding. The executive committee of the A. F. of L. elaborately proves that the Democratic platform is fairly liberal, but President O'Connor, of the Longshoremen's Union, boosts Harding because he says no party backed by the solid South can do justice to labor. Senator Reed is against the League and for Cox, its avowed champion; Mr. Taft is for the League and against Cox. There you are. It is no wonder that under these circumstances it is easy for the Democrats and Republicans to fuse wherever they fear the Socialists or the Nonpartisan League or any other group with a real program. Still, the campaign, besides being amusing, furnishes opportunity for a whole lot of editorial writers to discourse wisely on the precise difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. And those same editors when they think of theology at all doubtless laugh at the quibblings of the theologians!

What the Left Hand Doeth

ONE of the reasons alleged by Mr. Colby for the refusal of the United States Government to deal with Soviet Russia is "that the present rulers of Russia do not rule by the will or the consent of any considerable proportion of the Russian people." Truly the age of miracles is with us if the victories of Soviet Russia were achieved without even the passive support of the people. But however this may be, Secretary Colby is on dangerous ground when he refuses to recognize governments resting on force. Our administration has recog-

nized the Finnish government, which came to power after the shocking atrocities of the pro-German General Mannerheim. It has given tacit support to the equally atrocious Horthy government in Hungary. It recognizes the British Ambassador as the spokesman for Ireland, which has emphatically repudiated him; for India, a country which it has been considered best not to have the Prince of Wales visit; for Egypt, annexed in defiance of all British promises. What is far worse is that Mr. Wilson's administration without even authorization of Congress has established an American imperialism in the Caribbean; and at the very time Mr. Colby's note was made public came news that South American journalists had protested against the court-martial of three Dominican patriots for the crime of denouncing our military rule.

Profits vs. Homes

I N New York City alone there is a housing shortage in excess of 100,000 apartments. The consequence of this shortage in terms of morals and good health cannot be exaggerated. This situation is not peculiar to New York. The Philadelphia chapter of the American Institute of Architects says that from ten to twenty billion dollars will have to be expended in order "to house decently the present population of the United States." The situation in New York has led Governor Smith to call a special session of the legislature. The politicians are talking some sort of state aid to stimulate home building. Orthodox economics rests on the doctrine that private initiative and private enterprise inspired by the desire for private property are the only possible bases for the organization of industry and the sufficient guarantee for production of those things necessary for human welfare. Yet landlordism and the profit system utterly fail to provide us homes, and the Philadelphia architects propose that housing be legalized as a public utility! To point the moral would be to spoil the story.

A Legislative Quandary

THE special session of the New York Legislature is likely to do more for politics than for homes. Governor Smith has the Republicans in rather an awkward corner. In calling a special session of the Legislature he also ordered special elections in five districts to fill the places made vacant by the ousting of the Socialists. The Socialists will probably be re-elected. Will the Republicans try to throw them out again? If so, will Speaker Sweet again win the support of the Democrats? Will liberals follow the lead of the New York *World* and support the re-election of the ousted Socialists in order to vindicate representative government? The country will find it worth while to keep an eye on the State of New York.

A Notable If Tardy Report

THE publication of the Interchurch World Movement report on the steel strike (which we hope to review at length next month) is not only in itself a notable contribution to the literature of the labor movement, but is an encouraging evidence that the spirit of justice, truth, and social understanding has not wholly departed from the churches. But gratitude to the Interchurch World Movement for its courage in finally issuing this report in spite of strenuous opposition is somewhat tempered by regret that an interim report could not have appeared during the strike itself. It did not take all these months to discover that Judge Gary rejected collective bargaining or that the steel corporation made shameless use of spies. An interim report might possibly have molded public opinion in time to have avoided the complete defeat of the strikers and the incalculable consequences that are bound to flow from the triumph of Judge Gary's industrial autocracy. Already there are signs of the renewal of the conflict. The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, whose defection from the organizing committee we reported last month, has now announced that it will return to the fold since Messrs. Fitzpatrick and Foster, of whom it disapproved, are no longer connected with the general committee. Of the sincerity of the Amalgamated's stand we shall not attempt to judge. Its officers are, however, quite likely to discover that to the United States Steel Corporation there are no good and bad unionists, but only bad. Samuel Gompers is as objectionable to Judge Gary as William Z. Foster.

Russia and Britain—A Fundamental Rivalry

A FRENCH professor has written that the conflict which disturbs Europe and Asia is between the Russian bear and the British whale. His statement is true in spite of the fact that his own government is more bitterly anti-soviet than the British and lacks Lloyd George's uncanny skill at compromise. Behind all lesser conflicts is the supreme rivalry between Britain and Russia. In a sense there is no country in Asia or in Europe which does not feel the effect of that conflict. It is a conflict partly between different nations, more largely between differing ideals. It will continue even if, as we devoutly hope, there is an end of armed combat. The Russian ideal depends largely on propaganda and has made headway in Britain itself. It furnishes an organizing principle for resistance to British imperialism to which Hindus, Arabs, Turks, Mesopotamians, and Persians have rallied. It is difficult to see how these people who are practically without machine industry are ready for a modern communist state, but at least they can grasp that part of the Russian ideal which is opposed to imperialism. It is the fashion to de-

nounce the Russian program in the East as signifying "the eclipse of civilization." On our part, we believe that if, under Russian inspiration, Turks, Armenians, Arabs, Persians and men of all other races of the Middle East can meet in amicable conference at Baku or anywhere else to plan the deliverance of their peoples from imperialism, real civilization will find more cause for hope than for despair.

Germany and France in the European Conflict

IN the present conflict in Europe, Germany holds a strategic position. Allied mistakes are Germany's opportunity. The extreme terms of the Treaty of Versailles were impossible from the beginning and they are bound to be further modified. If Germany should make common cause with the Russians she may be able to overthrow the whole treaty of Versailles and compel new terms of peace. If, on the other hand, she makes common cause with the Allies she can demand a high price.

Meanwhile the French outlook is bad. Her government is wildly militaristic and imperialistic but inefficient. Her population is at a standstill. Her resources are limited. However much she may quarrel with Britain, her empire depends upon British good will in the Near East and in Africa. Her policy toward Germany has already sown the seeds of a war of revenge. French imperialism finds a serious menace in the thought of Germany allied either with Russia or England. Whether it is fear of an ancient foe, economic greed, or dreams of grandeur which lie behind the French attempt to revive the traditions of Louis XIV and the first Napoleon, the result is bound to be disastrous. It is not a capitalistic, militaristic France which will find security or fulfill the true destiny of her people.

American Capital Spreads Its Web

SO far as the present conflict in Europe is concerned, the United States is playing no great rôle. The near future may tell a different story. As the world's creditor nation, America, or, to be accurate, American capitalists, are bound to make increasing investments abroad. In Europe there is a growing fear of American capital. Max Worth, European staff correspondent of the *Federated Press*, quotes French reports that American capital is buying up the silk industry around Lyons and is suspected, according to one newspaper, of seeking to acquire the tobacco monopoly. "Is the economic patrimony of the nation," asks *L'Humanité*, "to be dismembered for the benefit of American capitalism?" It is this potential power of American capitalism, not only in Europe, but throughout the world, which will inevitably lead to new and serious American entanglements in foreign affairs, no matter what is done about the League of Nations.

Women Are Finally People

AT last Tennessee became the thirty-sixth state to ratify the suffrage amendment. All the women of America, that is, white women, duly naturalized, can vote for President in 1920. This is cause for rejoicing even if there isn't anything very exciting about choosing between Cox and Harding (of course the women might consider Debs or Christensen). The value of woman suffrage is not that it will bring in a political millennium, but that it is a symbol that women are human beings as truly as men, with the right of human beings to a voice in government. And if the ballot is worth anything at all the women certainly ought to have something to contribute through it. Already the suffragists, especially of the National Woman's Party, have worked out invaluable methods of political propaganda and education. We rejoice that their energies are now released to tackle some of the fundamental problems before the men and women of America. The pioneers of woman suffrage may have had more faith in what political democracy could accomplish than their descendants who saw the triumph of the cause. They could have had no clearer sense of the public task women must help perform.

A Tale of Human Kindness

JOSEPH GOLLOMB, a staff writer for the Federated Press, has given us a charming picture of genuine human kindness. By chance he was in Austria when a trainload of children dressed in their pathetic best, but tragically hungry and not a little homesick, started off for Italy. They went at the invitation of the Italian workers of Milan and Trieste for a three months' stay. By accident Mr. Gollomb was in Trieste some three months later. Again he saw a trainload of Austrian children, this time bound for home, sun-burned, happy, "their eyes radiant with health." They had come to the station in the trucks of the Workmen's Cooperative Association. The little procession of children and foster parents was led by Italian workmen. Attached to the train was a freight car, and on the freight car was an army field kitchen with great copper kettles "steaming with appetizing odors." This kitchen had been captured by the Italians from the Austrians. Now its equipment is painted a clear Socialist red, and in white upon it are the words (in Italian), "For the children of the proletariat." It was going to Vienna to feed the children on the return journey, when it would return with a new load of half-starved visitors. As the train pulled out the children cried not only "Long live Trieste," but "Long live the Internationale." Maybe some Americans who have plenty of food for the body owe something to these Italian workers for feeding their faith in the kindness of human nature and its power to remake the world.

Mr. Garvey's Black Republic

OF all extraordinary conventions the Negro assemblage inspired by Marcus Garvey which has recently been in session in New York takes the prize. Mr. Garvey is a Jamaican whose first operations in the United States seem to have been the formation of the Black Star Steamship Line, for which he is said to have collected from enthusiastic Negroes large sums of money. The steamship line grew into the Universal Negro Improvement Association and boomed mightily, perhaps beyond the expectations of Mr. Garvey himself. Anyway he had genius enough to seek for a big ideal to hold it together. He found it in the conception of "Africa for the Africans," a black republic or empire, it doesn't much matter which. Recently he was elected Provisional President of Africa, but one of his followers hailed him as President, Emperor, or Potentate. He wears grand robes of office and invoked enormous enthusiasm at a Madison Square Garden meeting. Another man named Eason has been elected Negro Leader in the United States and is to have a "Black House" in Washington. The organization has repudiated radicalism in America and stands by the Republican Party. But it has made overtures to De Valera, the Hindus and Soviet Russia for alliance in the African venture. Of course the Convention demanded Negro rights in the United States. It is all very humorous or very pathetic according to the point of view. But the growth and enthusiasm of the organization are profoundly significant of the growing discontent of the Negro against the arrogant overlordship of the white man.

Sound Law or Mob Psychology?

THE conviction of the twenty Communist Labor Party members in Chicago is another evidence of the failure of a typical American jury to understand what freedom means. After these men had been found guilty, one of the jurymen stated in the *Chicago Daily News*: "Although no evidence of overt acts was presented in this case, we were certain that had the defendants carried their revolutionary program to its logical conclusion, or had it run its course, a state of anarchy would have been brought about. There would have been confusion and chaos. The defendants would have disrupted the labor organizations." This statement means only one thing: The jury, having been subjected for many hours to the cheapest sort of "patriotic" emotional appeals, decided that under the Illinois law it was a good thing to send men to jail whose program in their opinion would result in confusion and chaos. This is the negation of all civil liberty.

If men would spend half the ingenuity and display half the capacity for sacrifice in a search for substitutes for war that they have spent on war might not a new way be found to conquer tyranny?

The Law of Suffering

By M. K. GANDHI

NO country has ever risen without being purified through the fire of suffering. A mother suffers so that her child may come into the world and live. When the wheat is gathered the seed grain perishes. Life comes out of Death. Will India rise out of her slavery without fulfilling this eternal law of purification through suffering?

If my critics are right, it would seem that India is to realize her destiny without travail. For their chief concern is that the events of April, 1919, should not be repeated. They fear the policy of non-cooperation because it would involve the suffering of many. If Hampden had argued thus he would not have withheld payment of ship money, nor would Wat Tyler have raised the standard of revolt. English and French histories are replete with instances of men continuing their pursuit of the right irrespective of the amount of suffering involved. The actors did not stop to think whether ignorant people would not have involuntarily to suffer. Why should we expect to write our history differently? It is possible for us, if we will, to learn from the mistakes of our predecessors how to do better, but it is impossible to do away with the law of suffering which is the one indispensable condition of our being. The way to do better is to avoid, if we can, violence from our side and thus quicken the rate of progress, and to introduce greater purity in suffering. We can, if we will, refrain in our impatience from being the wrongdoer, from imposing our will by physical force as Sinn Feiners are doing today, or from coercing our neighbors to follow our methods as was done last year by some of us in bringing about *hartal* [a general strike]. Progress is to be measured by the amount of suffering undergone by the sufferer. The purer the suffering, the greater is the progress. For this reason did the sacrifice of Jesus suffice to free a sorrowing world. In his onward march he did not count the cost of suffering entailed upon his neighbors, whether it was undergone by them voluntarily or otherwise. Thus did the sufferings of a Harischandra [a character in the Hindu epic, *Ramayana*] suffice to reestablish the kingdom for truth. He must have known that his subjects would suffer involuntarily by his abdication. He did not mind, because he could not do otherwise than follow the truth. I have already stated that I do not deplore the massacre of Jallian al Begh [scene of the Amritsar massacre] so much as I deplore the murder of Englishmen and the destruction of property by ourselves. The frightfulness at Amritsar drew away public attention from the greater though slower frightfulness at Lahore, where the attempt was made to break the spirit of the inhabitants by a slow proc-

ess. But before we rise higher we shall have to undergo such things many more times till they teach us to undergo suffering voluntarily and to find joy in it. I am convinced that the Lahorians never deserved the cruel insult that they were subjected to; they never hurt a single Englishman; they never destroyed any property. But a wilful ruler was determined to crush the spirit of a people just trying to throw off his chafing yoke. And if I am told that all this was due to my preaching Satyagrah,* my answer is that I would preach Satyagrah all the more forcibly so long as I have breath left in me and tell the people that next time they would answer O'Dwyer's insolence not by opening shops because of threats of forcible sales, but by allowing the tyrant to do his worst and letting him sell their all—except their unconquerable souls.

Sages of old mortified the flesh to set free the spirit within so that hardened bodies might be proof against any injury that might be inflicted on them by tyrants seeking forcibly to impose their will. And if India wishes to revive her ancient wisdom and to avoid the errors of Europe; if India wishes to see the Kingdom of God established on earth instead of that of Satan, which has enveloped Europe; then I would urge her sons and daughters not to be deceived by fine phrases or by the subtle terrors that India may have to undergo, but to see what is happening today in Europe and from it to understand that we must go through suffering even as Europe has—but without the process of making others suffer. Germany wanted to dominate Europe and the Allies wanted to do likewise by crushing Germany. Europe is no better for Germany's fall. The Allies have proved themselves to be just as deceitful, cruel, greedy, and selfish as Germany was or would have been. Germany would at least have avoided the sanctimonious humbug that one sees associated with the many dealings of the Allies.

The mistaken acts that I deplored last year were not in connection with the sufferings imposed upon the people, but with the tragic errors made by them and the violence they committed through failure to understand sufficiently the message of Satyagrah. What, then, is the meaning of cooperation in terms of the Law of Suffering? We must voluntarily put up with the losses and inconveniences that arise from having to withdraw our support from a Government that is ruling against our will. Possession of power and riches is a crime under an unjust government; poverty in that

*The doctrine of the assertion of right without physical violence.

†O'Dwyer was the governor of the Punjab.

case is a virtue, says Thoreau. It may be that in the transition state we may make mistakes; there may be avoidable suffering. These things are preferable to national subjugation.

We must refuse to wait for the wrong to be righted till the wrongdoer has been roused to a sense of his iniquity. We must not for fear of ourselves or others having to suffer remain participants in it. But we must combat the wrong by ceasing to assist the wrongdoer directly or indirectly.

If a father does an injustice it is the duty of his children to leave the parental roof. If the head master of a school conducts his institution on an immoral basis, the pupils must leave the school. If the chairman of a corporation is corrupt, the members thereof must wash their hands clean of his corruption by withdrawing from it; even so, if a government does a grave injustice the subject must withdraw cooperation, wholly or par-

tially, sufficiently to turn the ruler from his wickedness. In each case conceived by me there is an element of suffering, whether mental or physical; without the suffering, it is not possible to attain freedom.

NOTE: The Non-Cooperation Movement to which Mr. Gandhi refers was adopted at a joint Hindu-Moslem Convention primarily as a protest against the terms of the British treaty with Turkey, in the enforcement of which Indian troops and funds have been used. The movement has four stages: First, renunciation of honors and titles conferred by the English King. Second, resignation from Government positions, salaried or honorary. Third, resignation of soldiers and police from their respective positions. Fourth, if all else fails, absolute refusal to pay taxes to the British Government. The first stage of the movement went into effect August first. American dispatches give no definite information as to the progress of the movement.

Rates, Cars and Men

THE recent decisions of the Railroad Labor Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission serve to relieve the immediate tension in the railroad situation. They by no means solve the problem. The two million railway employees get an increase averaging \$1 a day. The total comes to \$600,000,000. This figure is a 22 per cent. increase over their present wages, as against a 40 per cent. increase for which the men asked. The railroad workers have accepted this advance, but are by no means satisfied with it. For instance, take the case of a fireman: Under the new schedule he gets \$5.52 a day, but in many cases the end of his run finds him far from home, so that, in addition to maintaining his own home, he has not only to buy food, but hire living quarters in a town miles away. In consequence, he has far less than many a man receives for less skilled and less dangerous work. The same thing is true of engineers, conductors, and trainmen, some of whom are better paid and some worse paid than the firemen.

On the other hand, the roads have been granted increases in the passenger and freight rates estimated at \$1,500,000,000. This is almost the total amount for which they asked. Deducting the \$600,000,000 which goes for wage increases, the roads get \$900,000,000 more a year than in the past. The deficit under federal management was about \$115,000,000, and railway employees charge that this deficit was at least in part the result of a deliberate attempt of the managers to sabotage government control in the interest of private operation. However that may be, it is clear that the return of the roads means that the people are to pay the railroad companies \$785,000,000 more in increased rates than they paid in taxes to make good the deficit under federal operation.

This increase, it may be answered, is necessary for efficiency. Is it? A year ago freight cars were moving twenty-eight miles a day under federal unified control, whereas now under private control they are moving twenty-two miles a day. The roads are asking for 300,000 more cars. But *The Nation* presents figures to show that if the cars now in use averaged twenty-eight miles it would be equivalent to the addition not of 300,000 but of 600,000 cars! *Labor*, the organ of the Plumb Plan League, contains in nearly every issue letters complaining of freight cars side-tracked so long that grass is growing in them. From another angle the roads are criticised. The statistician W. Jett Lauck points out that the railroads themselves are victims of profiteers to the extent of \$500,000,000 a year. This sum represents the overcharges on purchases of coal, equipment, etc. Why do the roads submit to such profiteering? Perhaps because their directors are also directors in the profiteering concerns. This profiteering is encouraged and not discouraged by the terms of the Esch-Cummins bill which directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to raise rates high enough to pay to the roads six per cent. on capital regardless of wastes due to mismanagement.

Every man, woman, and child in the country has something at stake in the cost and efficiency of railroading. The increase granted the railroad companies averages about \$75 a family, but both former Director-General Hines and Mr. Robert W. Woolley of the Interstate Commerce Commission have repeatedly stated that for every dollar added to freight earnings the consumer pays from \$3 to \$5 in added costs. Taking the lowest estimate, that means an increase in the average family budget not of \$75, but of \$225 a year. The railroad officials

are warning the public against such profiteering and claim that the increase in rates will be more than counterbalanced by a reduction in prices due to stabilization of business conditions. We are among the doubters. Only time will tell. But the ultimate consumer is not the only man to fear the effect of the increase in rates. High freight rates bear hardly upon the farmer, because the price of wheat is fixed in the Liverpool market and the increased freight cannot be wholly shifted to the ultimate consumer. Already farmers are declaring that the raising of wheat is not profitable but is conducted at a loss. An increase in rates is therefore serious. But more serious is the inability of the roads to move the crop at all. Wheat piles up in western grain elevators. In Texas spring cabbage and potatoes are rotting for lack of cars. In Detroit it was reported that 40,000 men were out of work on account of a shortage in raw materials.

There is, we believe, an immediate remedy for this freight congestion. It is to take back the so-called outlaw strikers, two of whose representatives recently gave us a very enlightening statement of their case. Briefly, their story is this: The original walkout was literally a spontaneous movement of men who no longer could stand the shilly-shallying of both the railroads and the government on the wage problem; so they took a vacation. It was only this walkout that led to the final appointment of the railroad wage board. After a time the outlaws, or vacationists, organized the United Railway Employees of America, a new and inclusive industrial union which now claims a membership of 450,000—a fourth or fifth of the total number of railway employees. These men are still out on strike. Their places either are not filled at all or are filled by inexperienced men. It is primarily in consequence of this shortage of competent labor that the freight situation is so serious and the mileage of cars so unsatisfactory. From Dupon, Illinois, comes a report that an average of twenty cars a day are wrecked by mishandling. The members of this new railway organization, even though they now have other work, would go back to railroad-ing if under the terms of the wage award they were permitted to claim their old rights of seniority. This the roads deny to them, largely, so the independent unionists claim, at the behest of the chiefs of the established railway Brotherhoods. These chiefs are bound at all costs to maintain their power and are bitterly hostile to a new industrial organization. The new union is composed of men who finally left the brotherhoods only because they are hopeless of securing action through the old organizations, which give enormous power of control over the rank and file to their highly paid officers. In one Brotherhood two local chapters lost their charters because they tried to secure a special convention, in a manner prescribed by the constitution, in order to elect new officers. The Brotherhoods all have insurance features—an important matter to

railroad men. A member loses his insurance if he leaves the union, no matter how much he has paid in premiums. Yet in the face of such obstacles the new union was formed. In order to punish its members, the railway men and the Brotherhood chiefs, with the approval and perhaps at the behest of the Department of Justice, are penalizing the public, which cannot afford to satisfy anybody's vengeance at the cost of inefficient railway service. Hence the representatives of the United Railway Employees urge that public opinion exert its power to bring about their restoration with their old rights of seniority unimpaired. So much for the case of the "outlaws." If their story is correct—and it carries conviction—they are right in believing that their restoration to work will bring immediate relief. The ultimate solution of the problem lies, we believe, along the general lines of the Plumb Plan; but for that plan to succeed will require more intelligence and more cooperation than is shown by the quarrel between the Brotherhoods and the new union, or by the resignation of W. G. Lee, president of the Trainmen, from the Plumb Plan League.

Japanese Imperialism—and American Bad Manners

IF you ask a citizen on the Eastern seaboard what foreign problem most nearly concerns the United States he is likely to say something about Russia or Ireland; on the Pacific coast he is sure to speak of our relations with Japan. There is no doubt that the growth of Japanese imperialism in China and Siberia is serious. The best, indeed the only, excuse that can be made for it is that Japan but follows western models and that pressure of her growing population and her scanty supply of raw materials compel her expansion. Nevertheless the fact remains that her conduct toward China and all her dealings in Siberia culminating in the occupation of the Russian half of Saghalien are ethically indefensible. But so far as her relations with America are concerned these things are less important than the proposed legislation in California depriving Japanese of the right to hold or lease land or act as guardians of their own minor children born in America in whose name title to land is vested. Apparently the only crime of the Japanese is that they are Japanese, thrifty, and perforce clannish. That is crime enough. However irrational or un-Christian are racial antipathies, there is no blinking them. On this basis Japanese immigration to the United States requires careful thought. But it does not require bad manners or discourtesy to a proud and virile people. Nor is there anything in the facts that Californians have yet disclosed to justify hysterical fear. Out of California's 3,200,000 inhabitants there are 87,279 Japanese who own or rent 278,000 acres of land out of a total area of more than 18,000,000 acres. This is not a situation to justify precipitate legislation.

From Ireland

By ESTHER PHILLIPS

WE came in calmly enough on the thirtieth of June. To be sure, there were soldiers at the gangplank on the English side of the channel, and I felt letters of introduction to various questionable people jumping in my bag, but the sleepy soldiers in the half light never moved. From reading the English papers we had thought we should not be able to enter the country at all before the bands of martial law were fastened, but we soon decided the military were not the "authorities," either governmental or protective. The R. I. C. (Royal Irish Constabulary), all extra-size men in snug blue police uniforms, no longer hunt in pairs, but in fours and sixes. They look self-conscious—or we fancied so. Soldiers ride about on motor lorries. The people everywhere tolerate them as victims of a system, unable to help themselves; and indeed the English boys who challenge you on the road after dark—entrances to Dublin were dramatically barricaded with barbed-wire for a time—are pathetic enough.

Dublin goes about its ordinary business in the ordinary way. It is a leisurely city, with blue hills lying close to the ends of many of the streets. Of a Sunday everyone goes walking to the country, to the noisier seaside or the wood-edged roads for teas and picnics. At first it was hard to believe that these people, here on the street of a week-day, were republicans; that "Sinn Fein" was not a word to be whispered under the breath. As we walked about the first few days, across St. Stephen's Green, where the first shots of the 1916 uprising were fired, past the gray bones of the General Post Office across the Liffey, it was a temptation to halt, like the Ancient Mariner who "stoppeth one of three," and demand "are you a Sinn Feiner?" The answer, barring a little natural suspicion, would be "Yes."

Into the remotest districts the feeling has spread and the support grown. It is not merely that eighty per cent. of the people voted for Sinn Fein candidates in the last election, or that Dail Eirean is drafting bills and carrying on the unseen government; that municipal and district councils are being captured, or that republican courts are attended and their decisions supported by public opinion, not by hovering weight of arms, while the English courts are empty. This superseding of the machinery of alien government was a part of Sinn Fein's political program from 1906. Throughout their history the Irish people have dreamed of independence. Home Rule and Dominion Home Rule were names for freedom, for ground gained in the struggle. Now Sinn Fein is the voice of that ideal. It speaks in out-of-the-way places. We

were in furthest Donegal, an Irish-speaking district, where the fields are dug in rocky hillsides and the people hardly get a living even by going to Scotland as migratory workers for the harvest. One evening by the fire a small boy made us a speech, by request, mounting solemnly on the ledge of the stove to tell us the story of the Parliamentary Party kittens who became Sinn Fein kittens when "they got their eyes open." Sinn Fein is in the provinces.

Not being followers of national feeling *per se*, we could not be satisfied to observe only this unanimity of a people, nor believe that Ireland had only this to offer. The first question that claimed us, when we were still in Dublin, was: "What is the relation of all these agencies that have gone to the making of Ireland—Sinn Fein, the Gaelic League, Labor, the Cooperatives?"

The people of Ireland are remarkably awake to economic realities. Perhaps it is because the farmer has come up against the capitalist class in the very real person of the "gombeen" man (trader), who has maneuvered unscrupulously for his own profit until the cooperatives came to resuscitate the farmer's fortunes and his self-respect. Perhaps it is because English economic strangulation, whether designed or not, has had so obviously disastrous an effect on Irish industry. Facts are not dependent on motives. In any case, farmers and wide-awake young priests and party leaders realize that political without economic freedom is nil. Inevitably there are different definitions of this kind of liberty; but as Mr. Thomas Johnson, treasurer of the Irish Labor Party and Trade Union Congress, said, if you want a cheer anywhere in the country, you talk of the "Workers' Republic."

Labor in Ireland is far ahead of the organized movement in any other country except Russia. It is supporting Sinn Fein, but not blindly or with tied hands. The party is a means to an end, and Labor in a free Ireland will have its own ideas about a cooperative commonwealth. The tradition of Larkin and Connolly is very much alive, far more so than an outsider realizes, and it is the kind of revolutionary tradition that leads its children to virility, not to sloth. The present-day leaders, who claim to be even more advanced than the rank and file, are brilliant, independent men. The Irish Trade Union Congress in 1919 expressed its attitude particularly toward international affairs. That beginning August 2nd, 1920, facing the national circumstances of this year, will have an opportunity to show a spirit both practical and idealistic.

As for the Gaelic League, it, too, has its strand in the weaving. It is almost a commonplace to call it the greatest factor in the creation of the vivid national consciousness. The league's revival of language and literature is an outward sign of the mood of the country at present. Such nationalism, the fostering of a unique culture, international in its beauty and variety, need not grow provincial. It is a delightful experience to meet the students who have come to spend their holiday at a Gaelic college like that in a little village named "field of oats," spread in the sun beside the blue sea, with the mist-hung mountains of Donegal violet to the south. There are doctors, scientists, teachers, priests, attending classes each day, living in the white cottages with the people, singing the old songs and dancing the old dances. After all, the Gaelic State of which we dream is the decentralization and federation which existed before England came to the island, and can yet be interpreted and fash-

ioned to the most advanced theories of a democratically controlled industrial state.

Anyone who cares for this sort of thing—for the freedom and prosperity of peoples, for experiments in organization, for ideals of social justice and of the state, for imagination and poetry—must want Ireland to work out her own destiny. He is committed beforehand. Anyone else, whatever his viewpoint, must see that the watchword of the people is self-reliance. They consider themselves a nation at war. All violence could be controlled and would be stopped if England removed the "army of occupation." That is Sinn Féin's no-compromise answer. Whatever judgment one has to pass on the methods of either party, there are two things to bear in mind: The fine constructive work of the invisible government, and the tense, devoted national consciousness.

Dublin, July 30th.

Allen vs Howat

A Chapter in Labor History

By BENJAMIN STOLBERG

THE great coal strike of last December gave every Governor in the Union a unique opportunity to express graphically his industrial philosophy. Among those who grasped this opportunity most readily was Governor Allen of Kansas. He did not need to seek very hard and very long the path of his duty, for his social economy had become so consciously crystalized during the last few years of unrest that he was able to react to the emergency with almost the reflex of an instinct.

Governor Allen has come to the very sincere conclusion that the war and its subsequent upheaval have spoiled both Capital and Labor. He feels that Capital is devoluting into its most atavistic reaction of profiteering; that Labor is evermore revolting toward the reddest class-consciousness. Both are led by their worst spirits of mutual antagonism; and yet, somehow, subconsciously, in their game of blind-man's-buff with the long-suffering public, they collaborate.

For this public Henry Allen cares very deeply. It is the symbol of his political faith. It is synonymous with "the people" of political democracy. He feels that to let go of this faith is to admit the class stratification of American society; and this admission, in his own mind and in the social structure, he resents with all the tenacity of a virile personality. And with all virile tempers he shares a touch of intolerance. To him all those who would compromise on the kind of political democracy

which developed "the great American Home" are detrimental to our society. Hence his bitterness to the Adamson law, to the Plumb plan, to "radical" labor. And hence also his support of "Law and Order" in its current significance.

That "Law and Order" means the *status quo* the Governor denies most vigorously. To him it implies social adjustment. The law he has in mind is social evolution, and the order amplifies it into gradual social evolution. Toward such a development of industrial economy the Court of Industrial Relations is an ideal Spencerian device. He very sincerely cannot understand how anyone in his senses should object to the adjudication of industrial nuisance, unless one is personally interested in industrial unrest. Why should men prefer the strike to a tribunal?

For his tribunal Governor Allen has all the affection of parentage. He takes great pride in its powers and he means it to be fair to all sides. In his loving imagination he endows the Court of Industrial Relations with all the judicial powers it otherwise constitutionally might possibly lack. The term "court" is more honorific than descriptive. It is not a court in the conventional meaning of the term. It is an exaggeratedly socialized Public Utilities Commission. The legislature officially dismantled the State Public Utilities Commission and bequeathed its powers entirely to the Court of Industrial Relations.

The Court consists of three judges—one presid-

ing judge and two associate judges. The home of the presiding judge, Mr. J. W. Huggins, is Emporia. They have in Emporia a Civic Forum, before which someone read in 1917 a cautious paper favoring the trade unionism of the late '80's. In the discussion which followed Mr. Huggins opposed "this sort of radicalism" on the good old-fashioned grounds of *laissez faire* economics. Mr. Huggins has a long and able record as a corporation lawyer, with an enviable reputation for sharp and cool judicial-mindedness. It is for these qualities that the Governor appointed him to head the Court. As the Governor put it to me, he intended "Judge Huggins to hold the balance between the great big heart of Judge Wark and the scrupulous administrator, Judge Reed." Judge Wark was a member of the State legislature from the most agricultural district of Kansas and Judge Reed, prior to his bench appointment was Governor Allen's private secretary.

Of course, the background of the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations one must seek in Kansas itself. Kansas is not an industrial state. She is our rural state *par excellence*. Needless to say the words *rural* and *backward* are not interchangeable. A state which has given to the nation John Brown, the Granger Movement, and Populism, cannot be accused of lacking in the spirit of progress. But by and large the people of Kansas do not appreciate the enormous difficulties of industrial democratization because their economy and hence their state of mind is essentially agrarian. Kansas has only two significant industrial centers: the great packing houses in her northeastern corner and the Pittsburg mining fields in her southeastern corner. The workers in the packing industry were only recently, and partially and weakly, organized. The miners, on the other hand, are totally and strongly organized. Pittsburg, therefore, is the only infected industrial focus in a State otherwise—at least on the surface of things—peacefully rural.

Within the small radius of the coal region not only the miners but the entire community is inclined toward "radicalism." Under the leadership of Alex Howat the miners have learned to speak their minds freely with the freedom of "ruffian" industrialists; and they have been able to impress their social solidarity upon the rest of the district, especially since, with the abolition of the company store and bank, the business interests of Pittsburg are all dependent upon their good will. When Governor Allen, during the December coal strike, asked the Pittsburg bankers for the privilege of banking for his "volunteers," all the local banks refused on the ground that they had to go on living in Pittsburg after his "volunteers" had left. But outside this radius the farming vote is extremely conservative. Liberalism to the Kansas farmer has no "Committee of Forty-Eight" significance. It does not meddle with the roots of our social order. It simply connotes a benevolent attitude toward

such statutory experimentation as the anti-cigarette law, or the provision for the sterilization of the hopeless mental or moral invalid.

Such "progressivism" the Court of Industrial Relations fulfills admirably. It does propose a radical remedy in its startling simplicity of industrial philosophy. If cigarettes are admittedly bad for our health, let us have a law interdicting cigarettes. Anyone from Elbert H. Gary to William Z. Foster must admit that society suffers from boycotts and strikes. Then let us have a Court of Industrial Relations. The strong bourgeois farming sentiment of the state at large and the comparative isolation of its industrial nuclei offered a very possible realization of this "law-and-order" program. What the spirit of Calvin Coolidge is supposed to have done for Boston, that the Court of Industrial Relations proposes to catch and carve into the iron tablets of the State of Kansas.

Before the Court went down to Pittsburg it had a chance to get a little training in lesser industrial problems in its own home town. It unconsciously wanted to demonstrate its unprejudiced spirit before tackling the Pittsburg issue and accepting the challenge of Alex Howat, President of the United Mine Workers of America, District 14, that he would pay no attention to the "Court of Industrial Slavery—not a law, but an outrage." The first case brought to the attention of the Court was the combination complaint of Attorney General Richard J. Hopkins and four officers of the Topeka Local Union No. 841 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers regarding wages and hours of labor. This case the Court decided with a compromise which was entirely satisfactory to both capital and labor. The next case, concerned with the railroads, the Court never had a chance to decide, for its railroad docket was suddenly swamped into a deadlock by the Outlaw Switchmen's Strike.

Finally Mr. Hopkins with a few unauthorized miners brought to the Court a formal complaint on the mining situation. I mean no cynical derogation to the Allen forces when I say that they were most obviously nervous over the Pittsburg issue. "The Allen group is scared to death" was the almost unanimous opinion of the faculty of the State University no matter on what side were individual sympathies. When the Governor last January recommended this industrial legislation he directed it explicitly and implicitly primarily against the possible recurrence of the great coal strike of last December. He personally advertised the Court into national prominence. Should it fail to function in Pittsburg, its failure would be dramatic.

Well, as a piece of *real politik* the court did collapse the moment it began its hearings in Pittsburg on April 6th. It intended to inform itself on many points: on the state of the mines with reference to working conditions, hours of labor, safety, sanitation: on the cost of living; and on the general life of

a mining family. The operators testified with as little enthusiasm as did the few "renegade" miners. The inquiries of the Court lacked the one prestige which it needed most, and that was the testimony of the United Mine Workers of America. The feeling in the community was intense that the Court could not investigate the troubles and trials of a group which justly or not met it on all sides with mixed hatred and contempt. The Court liked Mr. Howat as little as Mr. Howat liked the Court. But Mr. Howat's moral position with his constituency was strengthened by the very enmity of the Court, while the Court needed Mr. Howat's testimony most desperately on account of his position as the President of the Kansas Miners. Moreover, the Court is not all-too-popular with the operators.

The experience of the Court in Pittsburg showed that with the strong opposition of organized labor the limit of its capacity remains of necessity a petty wage-and-hour controversy like the Topeka Edison case, but not a fundamental and intricate problem in industrial unrest. In Pittsburg the Court did not even begin to function. Mr. Howat and three other officials of the miners disregarded its "summons," as they said they would. Whereupon the Court appealed to the nearest established judiciary to hold the labor leaders in contempt. Judge Curran of the Franklin County Court then ordered them to testify before the Industrial Court, and after they ignored his order he put them in jail.

When the jail door in Girard, Kansas, shut behind Mr. Howat, Governor Allen lost his fight. This door seemed to be telepathically connected with the mine pits of the state. Without the call of a strike, without any warning, premeditation, collusion whatsoever, twelve thousand miners threw down their picks and went out on a holiday. The usually strike-torn district of Pittsburg had not had a single strike since last December, an unprecedented record, which was now broken by the mere presence of the Court of Industrial Relations.

In the columns of the *Pittsburg Headlight* and the *Kansas City Star*, Alex Howat is an ignorant, unreasonable, rough and red adventurer, agitating a banquet existence off the maelstrom of industrial unrest. I did not get the opportunity of close acquaintance with Mr. Howat. He seems "rough." I met him at his office when he had just gotten back from the Ottawa prison, and he was swearing away unprintably at the discomforts of two days' incarceration in Kansas jails.

That afternoon about seven thousand miners greeted their four officials back with a rousing wild reception at the Franklin Mining Camp, several miles out of Pittsburg. There Howat lived up to the rather conventional popular conception of the labor "agitator." For two hours he stood up before the crowd enjoying tremendously its indubitable loyalty to his leadership, repeating over and over again his fundamental objections to the Court of Industrial Relations. Howat's sincerity is unquestioned even by most of his enemies; his statesmanship, however, is occasionally questioned even by some of his best friends. At times he seems to be incapable of differentiating men from issues, and therefore a note of personal rancor frequently clouds his cause. But to the cause of labor he is devoted with the full fanaticism of an all-absorbing loyalty. The worst one can say of him is that he suffers from the defects of a one-track faith. For years he has been the storm center of an antagonized and a progressively brutalized industry in which both sides fought with all the savage anarchy of a Sicilian vendetta. Right or wrong, he has been increasingly forced into the conviction that Queensbury rules are lost on the fellow who fights catch-as-catch-can. He catches as he can. I do not mean to imply that Mr. Howat makes the impression of being "capable of anything." On the contrary, he somehow impresses one as if he held back a great reserve of personal kindness for his non-official relations. But one also feels that a long industrial struggle with "Captains of Industry" and other forces of actual or imaginary reaction, such as the Press and the Church, have hardened him into an attitude of stubborn suspicion, whose conscience is troubled by the most honest of compromises and whose favorite weapon is the fight to the finish. For two solid hours he played his powerful instinct for industrial freedom upon the rawest emotionality of seven thousand bruised and outraged and suffering men and women. For several years I had experience in family case work with charity agencies and in a good many other kinds of conventional philanthropy; but never yet have I seen whole communities living at such a low level of physical decency as I encountered in the Pittsburg mining district.

Alex Howat is not strong on theory. Within these two hours he advocated a complete solidarity of all labor in a way which would have carried him straight into Syndicalism. He advocated "Labor in Politics" in a way which stamped him theoretically as a Scheidemann socialist. He lapsed into the kind of an American idealism to whose implications Mr. Gary might conceivably have lent his support. Howat's sociology is not thought through. It is mainly based on a strongly developed instinct of class protection. He fights for the rights of his men, who have spent their lives tapeworm-like in the bowels of the earth, picking away at veins of coal, in a state of constant physical discomfort and frequent physical danger, for a low and seasonal wage. He is a courageous soldier in the army of labor, and not a calculating strategist in industrial warfare.

The strategist of the United Mine Workers of America in their fourteenth district is Phil. H. Callery, their scholarly and astute quiet little General Counsel. Some years ago Mr. Callery followed Walter Lippmann as secretary to the socialist Mayor Lunn

in Schenectady. He still is a socialist, one of the most poised and non-utopian socialists I ever met. His legal training emphasized to him the difficulty of too rapid change. He is one of those rare individuals whose philosophical blade is not dulled by the details of an active career, and he seems to absorb unconsciously the significant nuances of his times. This aloofness in the midst of a fight enables him to avoid personalities, to see the other fellow's side with a sympathy which not at all lowers his fighting efficiency; and it gives his judgments a singularly disinterested air, as if he were more of an onlooker to a fascinating tragedy than one of its star actors.

"We are not trying to prove to the courts of the state or the country the difference between a Court of Justice and a Public Utilities Commission. They need no such elementary education. We shall try to prove first to the State and then, if necessary, to the Federal Courts, the unconstitutionality of stuffing such a commission into vast social powers; powers which would enable it to interfere with social adjustments which it is congenitally unfit to solve. Of course, it may be that the defeat of this court will also prove the death blow to the more conventional Public Utilities Commission, because these commissions are willy-nilly increasingly called upon to wrestle not merely with technological but also with social problems. And we are against their socialization, because all of them without exception are loaded against labor. They cannot help but be, because the very reason of their existence is the growing need of Big Business to protect itself from its own suicidal greed. Their job is to make private profit function as much as possible in the public interest, an attempted co-operation which is becoming less possible and more anomalous every day. These commissions may kid themselves into an attitude of fairness, but that is all they can do, because the powers of labor have grown this last century arithmetically, while the powers of capital have grown geometrically. Hence the equal diminution of their powers in favor of a largely imaginary public is sheer nonsense. Capital can always show good reason why it cannot operate. It can always show reason for boycott. But from the point of view of national prosperity labor can never show good reason for a strike. But the right to strike is the only real weapon labor has. When labor folds its arms nobody suffers more acutely than does labor itself. When the miners do not work, neither do they or their families eat very much. The strike is a very crude weapon, but to relinquish this cudgel into the hands of three gubernatorial appointees would be rank insanity. When Governor Allen took over the mines last December he insisted that the miners immediately go back to work without even offering them the Garfield thirteen per cent. increase; and when we refused, he brought down red-cheeked college boys as 'volunteers,' and added

insult to injury by 'protecting' them with troops, though anyone who knew the local situation could have told him that not a finger would have been lifted against these deluded youngsters, who were led to believe that scabbing on one of our most exploited forms of labor is a civic and a patriotic duty."

"Mr. Callery, why does mining labor have the reputation of being radical?"

"Well, in the first place, it is very difficult to interpret contractual relations between the operators and the union, because mining is so full of incalculable technological difficulties. Coal may be 'faulty' in a hundred and one ways. It may have too much sulphur or some other foreign substance in it. A coal vein may have a 'slip,' i. e., a clay vein running in any imaginable direction, or a 'roll,' which is a vein of hard slate most difficult to 'blow out.' All these things furnish controversial points in wage and other adjustments. Then, the miner is in constant struggle with nature, whose wealth would naturally seem communal, and deep down in her darkness he has a better environment for introspection than probably any other kind of industrial worker. It is hard to come out of a mine shaft with a lot of enthusiasm for the Coolidge brand of 'law and order.'"

"This court will have to go. If the Kansas courts do not kill it, I am sure the United States Supreme Court will. The might of labor will render it inoperative, anyway."

There is little of significance to add to this story of the struggle between Allen and Howat. Since April the lower and superior courts of Kansas have declared the constitutionality of their disabled little stepbrother, the Court of Industrial Relations. And now Phil Callery is preparing his brief for the next higher court.

Practically, however, the April strike of the miners against the Howat incarceration has fought the court to an effectual standstill as far as the major and strategic industries are concerned. The "outlaw" railway strike ignored the court completely and successfully. And at the present time (August 4) the Kansas miners are again unmolestedly out on the strike which is gripping the Central and Southwestern coal fields. Governor Allen himself seems to have lost somewhat of his crusading spirit ever since a well-known Old Guard chieftain good-naturedly slapped him on the back ten minutes after the Harding-Coolidge nominations: "Sorry, Henry," was the stentorian exclamation, "but you never really seriously entertained any dark-horse ambitions with that court o' yours, did you?"

So the court is of necessity solving the industrial problem in Kansas piecemeal. Now it is tackling only one grocery store or box factory at a time, provided, of course, the particular grocery store or box factory has no objection to being tackled.

Voices from the Wilderness

ENOUGH evidences of pessimism, hopelessness, and reaction come out of every day's batch of news from Europe to give the most optimistic of us pause and make us feel at times that everything is going to smash and there is no hope save in a universal cataclysm which shall engulf us all and out of which a new civilization may perchance, Phoenix-like, arise. Swords have not been beaten into ploughshares, nor have the suffering and horror of the war turned men's faces toward peace. The power of control over men's lives is still vested in cynical reactionaries, and no measure of reform has been sufficient to loosen their grip. It is not to be wondered at under these circumstances that the thoughts of youth turn to violence as the only means of release. The situation is so acute as to beget extreme impatience with the fundamental truth that the final way out of the Slough of Despond in which we are caught can only be by the path of a new philosophy of life, a new confidence in God, a new realization of the dignity of personality and of the ultimate fellowship of men.

But there are still, small voices to be heard in the babel of European pessimism which do give hope of reason and peace. The wonder is, considering what Europe has gone through and is going through, that these voices are to be heard at all. Without apology, we are going to quote for our readers some of these clear cries from the wilderness of European depression.*

We may pass over with brief mention the powerful and thoughtful literature about war that is springing up in Europe much more than in America, and which gives hope that war may ultimately be seen as the ugly thing it is—that the laurel wreath may be stripped from the head of Mars and the lying voices of his minstrels be silenced. To young poets like Siegfried Sassoon and to authors like Philip Gibbs and Andreas Latzko the world owes an inestimable debt for the truth they have given us. In England, John Galsworthy has recently added a notable contribution to the truth about war in *Tatterdemalion*, in which he propounds the theory that only a more thorough-going effort to realize beauty in life can save mankind.

"There has never been anything to prevent the millennium," he says, "except the nature of the human being. There are not enough lovers of beauty among men. It all comes back to that. Not enough who want the green hill far away—who naturally hate disharmony, and the greed, ugliness, restlessness, cruelty which are its parents and its children.

"Will there ever be more lovers of beauty in proportion to those who are indifferent to beauty? Who shall answer the question? Yet on the answer depends peace. Men may have a mint of sterling qualities—be vigorous, adventurous, brave, upright and self-sacrificing, be preachers and teachers; keen, cool-headed, just, industrious—if they have not the love of beauty, they will still be making wars."

From Italy, too, comes news of a renaissance of idealism. A correspondent writes us:

"The regeneration of that national soul is proceeding apace. It is manifest in all the present trend and genius of Italy's literature. We have the extraordinary Giovanni Papini, for instance, turning from futurist art and politics to Christ. We hear him proclaiming to the Italian people that nothing can save civilization from disintegration except the conversion of men and institutions to the real Christ: not the Christ of the theologians or prelates, but the Christ of the apostles, of the fishermen and the tent-makers and the slaves. We have Amendola, before the war a philosophical recluse, now appearing as a member of parliament and making, the other day, the most remarkable speech that has been heard in any European parliament for many years. We may hear another Italian deputy and a member of an ancient family, the Duca di Césaro, insisting that civilization has become so materialistic in its psychology, as well as in its political and economic machinery, that it is better for mankind that it perish. Our duty is to prepare ourselves and others, he would say, for the creation of the new world amidst the falling ruins of the old.

"You will find there, in nearly every university town and in all the principal cities, groups of young professional men, as well as students, who take an attitude similar to that expressed by the Duca di Césaro. The old world-order is doomed, they hold, and they are to prepare and consecrate themselves to the building of the new order. In Florence, gathered about the Philosophical Library, some years ago founded by a wonderful American woman Mrs. Julia Scott, is one of these groups under the leadership of Dr. Roberto Assagioli, the young psychologist who is well known to many Americans. Its very presence has changed the whole spiritual atmosphere of Florence. In the university of Naples is a still more remarkable movement—a group of young men living the lives of actual saints. They are quietists, at the present time, and hard to get at unless you already know some one of them. But the austerity of their lives, the blend of high intellectual understanding with spiritual perception of purpose, moves one to say in their presence, 'in the beginning was the word.'"

One of the voices of a new spirit in Italian affairs

*THE WORLD TOMORROW is indebted to Frank W. Garrison for the translation of "Militarism and Anti-Militarism," by Julius Humbert-Droz; to Elizabeth Felden for translations from "Rassegna Internazionale," and to George D. Herron for information about Italy.

is the magazine called *Rassegna Internazionale*. In the last issue which has reached our desk (June, 1920) there is some astonishingly candid discussion of international problems. Georg Brandes writes caustically and convincingly of the utter failure of the Allies to work out the principle of self-determination in drawing the boundaries of European states. An anonymous writer criticises the Czechs for imposing their will by force upon the non-Czech population in their borders. Roberto Palmarocchio declares frankly: "The Italian people want to see Germany restored and become again the wonderful reservoir of productive energies." But most interesting of all is an article by Cesare degli Occhi.

"War cannot help being an evil," he writes, "because born from a negation of justice and of brotherhood; it is unjustifiable as a means, because its very existence means ruthless force; it is unjust because it leads innumerable spirits to exasperation by imposing extreme and odious sacrifices for unexplained ends.

"It is evident that if a religious spirit could vindicate his action—his war—as being politically and spiritually justified, he would have to pity his adversary, instead of hating him, for being compelled to fight in behalf of a wicked and arrogant might.

"It happens, moreover, as a fatal consequence of the violent means used in the pursuit of even a just cause, that the very goal is destroyed by those means used to win it. The primary object is changed and will be found impossible of attainment even through victory. A nation which demanded one city from another nation which unjustly held it must ask much more when the war is over because it has squandered, during the war, the fortune of its own people. And when the defeated enemy fails to meet that demand—and he inevitably cannot, because he has exhausted his resources—it becomes necessary to resort to every means of coercion. And so we pass from a war for a just frontier to a peace of invasion, possibly carried out by colored troops! In this way, the state of political necessity becomes perpetuated as well as the spiritual necessity. Even the dead, who ought to have but a single desire—that wars should cease to be—become in every country a sacred argument for a base campaign.

"Christians of those countries who won the war: beware of the victory.

"Christians, organize yourselves on an international basis to impose a just peace, and to deprecate war."

Among such arguments against war is a carefully thought-out discussion in the magazine *Cornobium*, written by a French-Swiss pastor, Jules Humbert-Droz. He has borne testimony to his faith by his works, for he refused repeatedly to accept the usual military service and was in consequence brought to trial before a military tribunal and sentenced to prison and to pay a money fine. M. Humbert-Droz argues that a chief lesson of the great war is that

militarism inevitably leads to war. Preparation for war means not only the amassing of armament, but the degradation of schools and churches to the ignoble task of spiritually preparing the people so that they will support the wars made by diplomats and profiteers. He goes on to consider the horrors of war—not merely the carnage of the battlefield and the lust of battle, but all the long chain of evils that attends it. Then he proceeds to point out that in addition to being a useless crime against humanity, so far from solving the problem it involves, war creates new ones and prepares new conflicts.

"The soldier is not a conscious human being in the full possession of his moral responsibility, but a pawn in the game of nations at war, a number without a soul, a killing machine without free will and independence." M. Humbert-Droz then considers offensive and defensive war and shows how well-nigh impossible it is to distinguish between them. He examines the usual justifications of extreme patriotism and finds them empty:

"The law of self-sacrifice for the community extends beyond the nation, which is only a part of the community. Above it is humanity. . . . The individual ought to sacrifice himself to the community, it is true; but he will serve the community the better as he enriches his personality, as he refuses to let himself be molded and belittled by the State, and as he declines to take part in the services of death which weaken instead of enriching humanity.

"During these last years nationalism has developed and the national sentiment has been exalted at the expense of the humanitarian sentiment. Nationalism has been the official religion of all the States and has ruled the civilized world like the basest of superstitions.

"I have said that we must defend humanity from nationalism by rejecting the war system. But we are told:

"It is necessary to defend civilization from barbarism;

"Democracy and liberty from militarism;

"Justice and right from brute force.

"I agree that it is necessary to defend these superior blessings of humanity, but they must be defended by means that correspond to the ends we seek. The present war shows us once more that the militarist system is not the means to employ; that it is the antithesis of the desired ends.

"The most typical example is the destiny of Germany during the last century. She had a period of splendid culture, with her great philosophers, her great musicians, her great writers, a wide range of science and art. But Germany was then weak from the military point of view. These blessings, of which she was justly proud, she prepared to defend by the militarist system, and as she became better prepared to defend them, as militarism developed, culture declined, became nationalized; her civiliza-

tion dwindled as her militarism grew. And thus, in preparing to defend it, Germany crushed what she wanted to defend.

"This experience is typical; it is verified in all countries and all civilizations. Developing civilization runs parallel with lessening militarism; the development of militarism marks a decline in civilization. Anglo-French civilization has fallen a long way since the beginning of the war, precisely because these States desired to defend their civilization by the militarist system.

"For the very reason that it is in the domain of the spirit, civilization defends itself with other arms than barbarism. To wish to defend it by the militarist system is to misjudge its nature. Civilization must overcome from within, from the center of each State, the militarism which chokes it." Only by ending militarism shall humanity be saved.

To those of us who are discouraged surely strength must come from listening to the voices of our brethren in many lands who in the midst of strife point out to us the way of peace.

Disillusion and Hope in Switzerland

By H. EMIL BRUNNER

THERE is much talk in America about skepticism and a general tiredness as a result of the great war. But when you arrive from New York in any port of continental Europe and settle down for a certain time, you come to see that the moral and intellectual fatigue of Europe is considerably greater than that of America. Reaction may not use quite as brutal means, but you feel a heavy, dull atmosphere of resistance which keeps down all energies on the one hand and creates over-nervousness on the other. There is an enormous abundance of intellectual production, new magazines and newspapers, over-brilliant writing with excited imagination and little sense for truth, mutual distrust everywhere, all the national groups held together only by the fear of another one, without constructive ideas. The dominant psychological factor is no doubt disillusionment and cynicism. All is vain; nothing is really worth while; let us eat, drink, and make good business. This is also to a large extent the situation in Switzerland. There was, for example, some years ago a hopeful student movement, which Romain Rolland found worth while to write about at length (*Les précurseurs*). It is no more now, or has become thoroughly "philistine." The students do not know what to study for. There is no conspicuous ideal to attract and focus young minds.

Socialism has become a strong factor since the war. The Socialist party, with almost a third of the seats, is the strongest party in the national parliament. It is also in control, or more or less so, in the city administration of our largest cities; e. g., Zurich, Basel, and Bern. There it has influenced the municipal expenditure to the extent that the financial basis of these cities is shaken almost to the point of bankruptcy. This is no surprise for anyone who knows the national and international implications of the capitalist system, which cannot be overcome locally or even nationally, but only internationally. Neither was it a surprise for those of us who do not hope so much of political, bureau-

cratic socialism as of a more syndicalist or guild-socialist type of collectivism. But whilst the political power of Socialism has been growing very rapidly, especially owing to the fact that large parts of the middle classes have been driven to the proletariat through the sufferings of the war, its case seems not to be very hopeful. First, there is a strong antagonism between the leadership and the masses. Most of our leading Socialists are adherents of the Bolshevik doctrines (some of them being close personal friends of Lenin and Trotsky), including the dictatorship of the proletariat. The rank and file, however, still hold democratic ideals, as was shown when they voted by an overwhelming majority against entering the Third International. Secondly, there is—as an inheritance of the time of German Marxian influence—a spirit of materialism, a sad lack of any sort of idealism, which tends to make Socialism a mere bread-and-butter question, or a fight for political power, without the sense of responsibility and without really constructive ideas. Also, the cooperative movement, which had a wonderful development during the war, is in great danger of becoming only a money-saving institution. Thirdly, for these and other reasons the gulf between the Socialists and the bourgeois classes, especially the peasantry, has become deeper than at any time. This, of course, means a deadlock in politics. The standpatters on both sides are in the forefront; there is no possibility of mutual understanding, and little chance for agreement. The best weapon of Socialism, the justice of its cause and its ideal right, seems to be out of date. After the Socialists have lost confidence that their cause must win out because it is backed up by justice and all that is truly humane, and have placed their confidence merely in the acquisition of political power or the power of arms, they have to fight the battle on this ground—with little chance of success. The peasantry—in numbers just as strong as the industrial population—has become thoroughly organized, politically and economically, and has formed a more

or less solid block with all other non-Socialist forces (i. e., most of the middle and the entire capitalist class), so that the Socialists have, besides the army of industrial workers, only very small resources. A general strike—if it could be repeated after the failure of that of 1918—would be met at once by a well organized strike of the farmers; the milk supply especially would be completely stopped, and the farmers would probably hold out much longer than the workers in the foodless cities, having the moral support of almost the whole of a third part of the population: the middle class and the capitalists. This deadlock will continue until the leaders come to see that force is a bad ally of Socialism as compared with its idealistic assets. This situation is the fruit of a certain type of Marxian doctrine, that the victory of Socialism is a matter of economic necessity and not before all a spiritual victory.

What the spirit of present-day Socialism is can be seen from the fact that in a recent vote on woman suffrage the Socialists were among the main forces to defeat the bill.

Another big question was the entrance of Switzerland into the League of Nations, a step that our Federal government proposed. In our country there is, as in all neutral countries, a deep disappointment about the peace treaty and the miserable wreck of the league plan. Besides a strong pro-German element, the Socialists, and the militarists, there was a vast number of voters who wrote their "No" for purely ideal reasons. They were afraid lest the League might prove to be a repetition of Metternich's Holy Alliance. By a very small majority, however, the bill was accepted, and the Swiss became the first nation which is on its own volition a member of the League.

You may be interested to know what are at present the sentiments of the Swiss with regard to America. On the whole, there is much sympathy for "our big sister republic" in bourgeois circles, although the Socialists look at it as a very backward country. But it is significant to see how soon the bourgeois becomes a Socialist when there is a question about America. Indeed, after Prussian militarism is crushed, the Anglo-Saxon capitalistic imperialism seems to be the greatest danger for the freedom and the national and economic independence of small nations. We see daily how American capital is pouring into poor, exhausted Germany, where entire blocks of city houses, enormous estates, and industrial plants are bought up by American financial concerns. Germany is being sold out to America—this is the general view, and nobody with us seems to be particularly delighted at the fact. We Swiss people have seen how difficult it is for a small industrial nation to stand the competition of an incomparably more powerful neighbor. And this will be as true of America as it was of Germany.

The most important driving power in Europe is still Bolshevik Russia. In spite of all that can

be said about the tyranny of the Bolshevik bureaucracy, it is true that it is the only great historical movement with a positive aim. The hope that goes out from there is by far the strongest factor in the labor movement, and the fear of it the only "positive" unifying force on the side of the bourgeois parties. The note of social revolution has been struck, and it will dominate until it is no more necessary. This, in addition to the apparent failure of the Bolshevik methods, seems to me the one hopeful element in our situation. The day of self-satisfied bourgeois civilization is over. Nobody really believes in reform any more. Those who have not lost hope look forward to a radical change. The events in Russia as well as in Germany, however, show more and more that this change can only be really radical if it is a change in ideals, a new confidence in the revolutionizing energy of the spirit. The gospel of our great Swiss prophet, Hermann Kutter, begins to be understood: that we need nothing but revolution—but a revolution which comes from a new awakening of the spiritual forces of justice and love.

Switzerland, July 27.

Glories of Our Blood and State

Prepare, Oh, Lord, to pardon those who died
Not for Thy will, but for their country's sake:
Prepare to purge this generation's pride
And with the sweet of wanton winning take
The faith that has in force of arms relied.
If we must worship, for our worship make
Godlike again, the young man crucified.

Not more. Oh Lord, reveal our ancient foe
Whom all our blind and blundering blows have
missed.

Not any nation, nor the mailed fist,
Not these the seed and sower of our woe.
The darkness in our hearts, Lord, make us see;
This is our old, unwounded enemy.

GENEVIEVE TAGGARD.

Our Saintly Forerunners

No man shall come into our commune who sayeth that the land may be sold. God's footstool is not property. (St. Cyprian).

God gave the same earth to be cultivated by all. Since, therefore, his bounty is common, how comes it that you have so many fields and your neighbor not even a clod of earth? (St. Chrysostom).

The soil was given to the rich and poor in common. * * * The pagans hold earth as property. They do blaspheme God. (St. Ambrose).

They wrongfully think they are innocent who claim for themselves the common gift of God. (St. Gregory the Great).

Quoted by the Press Bureau of the American Economic League from the *Johnstown* (Pa.) Democrat.

Paterson Points a Moral

By EVAN THOMAS

FOR those who may be doubtful concerning the ethics or the necessity of strikes the following story may be of interest:

Paterson, N. J., is a silk town. During the war-time prosperity in the silk industry all sorts of little shops were started up by ex-tradesmen, silk workers who had accumulated a little capital, and others, all playing a desperate game to get rich quick. The silk workers in Paterson had secured tolerable working conditions and in some branches of the industry an approach to a living wage; but not even in prosperous times were the majority of the silk workers in all trades organized.

A few months ago the slump came. The broad-silk shops began to close their doors or to work part time. Some of the smaller shops went under altogether. Those who survived started to take advantage of the desperate condition of the workers by cutting wages. Not only among the unorganized workers, but even among members of the unions there were some whose financial necessities forced them to go back to work at big reductions in wages. The fact that there was nothing like a one-hundred-per-cent. organization made it impossible for the unions to exert adequate control in the matter of wages and shop conditions under these extraordinary circumstances.

Conditions became more and more serious. On July 16th a great outdoor meeting of organized and unorganized workers was held, addressed by leaders of the United Textile Workers, affiliated with the A. F. of L., and the Amalgamated Textile Workers. Even the local press—usually hostile to labor—admitted that the meeting was “notable in Paterson’s labor history for its freedom from all evidence of malice, hatred, prejudice, or condemnation.” The speakers suggested a general strike only as a last resort, urging organization and a peaceable solution of the difficulties through an appeal to public opinion. Nevertheless, the situation remained unchanged, wages being cut, if anything, more than before.

By July 23rd the rank and file both in the U. T. W. and in the Amalgamated were convinced that only one thing could bring sufficient pressure to stop reductions in wages, and that was a general strike. The members of both unions voted for a general strike in the broad-silk industry to begin Monday, July 25th, at 5 o’clock in the afternoon, provided no conference could be arranged with responsible representatives of the silk manufacturers before that date. Accurate reports showed that wages had been reduced by fifteen to forty per cent. Both unions had repeatedly expressed themselves as ready to confer with the employers in

order to avoid a general strike. The newspaper continued to comment favorably on the restraint of the workers, and they were outspoken in their condemnation of the employers who had reduced wages. Up to this time the employers had made no statement, but with a strike voted for, Albert E. Wyman, secretary of the Associated Industries in Paterson, came to the defense of his organization. He declared that wages had been cut in only twelve shops and that those were concerns not connected with the employers’ association. To this the unions promptly replied that cuts had either already been made or were in contemplation in from fifty-six to one hundred shops—most of them independent, but some of them connected with the employers’ association. The Amalgamated went so far as to publish a partial list of the more important shops in which wage reductions had been made. This list went unchallenged by Mr. Wyman. Meanwhile the newspapers were urging conference. Even the *Press-Guardian*, after singing its usual hymn of hate against the Amalgamated, urged that the employers and workers “put their feet under the same table and adjust grievances—that is the American way.” Under these circumstances the Mayor of Paterson, Frank J. Van Noort, on July 24th sent an identical letter to the unions and the Associated Industries of Paterson urging a conference. “My interest,” he wrote, “in this matter is the interest of all the people of Paterson, the children of Paterson, as well as the men and women of Paterson.” The unions promptly accepted this invitation, but the papers announced that Mr. Wyman was out of town. So matters stood up to the day before that set for the general strike. Then came a message from the national office of the U. T. W. explaining that President John Golden refused to sanction the strike. Deprived of the support of the national office, it was virtually impossible for the U. T. W. to strike with the industry in a period of great depression. As the whole plan had been based on the principle of united action by all the unions in the hope of gaining the unified support of all the silk workers, unorganized as well as organized, nothing was left for the Amalgamated but to call the strike off as well. In fact each union had voted for the strike on the understanding that the others would cooperate, and thus it was hoped that some understanding with regard to wages could be reached with the manufacturers.

President Golden’s decision had tied the workers’ hands in Paterson under the circumstances, and a strike of importance was no longer to be feared by the city. Naturally, with the possibility of a

strike gone, the workers were more eager than ever to have their difficulties settled through a conference in "the American way." This story should end with a touching picture of capital and labor with "their feet under the same table" planning for the good of "the men and women and children of Paterson."

But on July 27th the secretary of the Associated Industries wrote the following letter to the Mayor of Paterson:

My dear Sir:

Replying to your letter of July 23rd, we wish to point out that since your letter was written the threatened general strike has not materialized. For this reason, there seems to be nothing further to be done.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT E. WYMAN, Secretary.

The Mayor did nothing, the newspapers did nothing. The bosses with a few exception cut wages more than ever. The unions are doing all in their power to assist individual shops here and there to resist reductions through shop strikes, but such fights are practically hopeless today as the employers well know. Only a general strike in the broad-silk industry could have brought about any action from the bosses or the public. It is all beautifully simple: since there is no general strike "there seems nothing further to be done." Never mind the smashing of hard-won standards; never mind the acknowledged injustice being done; never mind the smoldering discontent—for a time the bosses have the whip hand. What else matters?

It is this cynical spirit on the part of the employers, the politicians, and the press which provokes the workers to hatred and bitterness.

The story of Paterson has a nation-wide moral.

An Appraisal of Industrial Democracy

By JAMES MEYERS

It is our hope that Mr. Meyers' article may call out discussion from our readers. The general editorial position of THE WORLD TOMORROW on "Industrial Democracy" was set forth in connection with an article and symposium on the advanced plan of the Building Trades Parliament in England which appeared in our issue for December, 1919.

IT is a thankless task for me to defend any movement against the charge that it is not radical enough. It is hard for me to get up any enthusiasm about answering back. If what I am engaged in does not go to the roots of things, I should rather be doing something else. Yet many of my radical friends patiently, as with a child, point out to me that "Industrial Democracy" is not even headed in the right direction. Some say it is positively harmful in that it tends to abolish class lines and make working people tolerably contented. It will never do, they say, to let them get contented until after the capitalistic system root and branch has been destroyed. Well, I do not want to get into an "argument," for my friends know much more than I do; but I should like to point out how, to my mind, "Industrial Democracy" may make a definite contribution to orderly social progress. I do not claim that it is the last word of the New Order. I suppose that there is no last word, that human society will always be in a state of flux—always moving toward something better. But it does seem to me that Industrial Democracy (where it is sincere and radical enough) is a step along the road to a better day—a step in the right direction.

In the first place, this movement constitutes

the first voluntary recognition on the part of the owners of industry of the principle of democracy—the right of the workers to representation in the government of the industry in which they are employed. This is a definite step in advance of the prevailing capitalistic system of absolute autocracy and a step in the right direction. The value of this voice in the management varies, to be sure, with the degree of power which has been conceded. This in turn varies from the minimum of the "joint-committee" plans which have only the power to "confer" and "discuss"; up through the War Labor Board plans, where final arbitration is provided; up through the "Leitch" Plans, in some of which final arbitration is provided for and limited legislative powers are granted to the workers who elect the "House of Representatives" (the foremen constitute the Senate; the department heads the Cabinet); up to the three plans—File's, Proctor and Gamble's, and our own, which provide seats on the Board of Directors to representatives of the workers. In our plan at the Dutchess Bleachery* we also have a Board of Management, consisting of three elected operatives and three officers representing capital and management, which has the power to "settle and adjust any matter of mill management which may arise"—a blanket clause which it will be seen grants a very real degree of democratic control in the management of the mill.

It is true, I think, that thus far the workers'

*A full description of the Partnership Plan in effect at Wappingers Falls may be found in the New York "Evening Post" of February 6, 1920, by Ray Stannard Baker; also in the "Literary Digest" of March 6, 1920.

representatives under most of these plans have felt somewhat abashed in the august presence of the representatives of capital and management, and have not, as a rule, been very aggressive in their demands. This is one of the weak spots of "Industrial Democracy." It demonstrates, to my mind, the need of simultaneous organization of workers along union lines in order to supply the necessary independent spirit—the spirit which alone will secure real equality and a democracy worthy of the name in industry. I believe, however, that this independent spirit will grow even in unorganized plants as the operatives begin actually to operate the machinery even of a limited industrial democracy. And they will want more power in most cases—and I hope they will get it. It should be said, however, that in the local nature of industrial democracy there lies also possible strength and hope. For by it the peril of the "walking delegate" will be minimized; the autocratic power of officialdom in unionism will be controlled by the actual wishes of the workers concerned in each case.

Industrial Democracy also opens up a fascinating possibility of combining efficiency with democracy. When it shall come to pass that the people who work really receive the proper rewards of their toil, efficiency will still be a thing devoutly to be wished in order that the supply of the world's goods may increase and that there may be increasing comforts for all. Unhappily it is true that thus far democracy has generally been synonymous with inefficiency. A volunteer fire company is a very democratically managed organization, but one would not call it efficient. The German Empire was very efficient but autocratic. It seems to me that the greatest happiness in the world will come only when we combine democracy and efficiency. In this, Industrial Democracy is leading the way—combining the voice of the people and the practical wisdom of the workers with the trained knowledge of the manager, the engineer, the financial expert—for the good of all.

Industrial Democracy is training the workers in the laboratory of peaceful production, in the actual business of manufacturing and distributing the goods upon which humanity depends. Other methods of social reform are in danger of running to pure theory which does not always fit the facts, or else of training the workers almost wholly in the methods of successful class warfare. Such training has no more constructive value than the training which nations receive from international warfare—a training which we pacifists conceive to be worse than useless for the normal life of human society. If labor is to have increasing power in industry, surely it is vastly important that labor should be trained in the business of production rather than in the business of organized war. In addition to the information and education in the problems of management which our elected workers' representatives receive at Wappingers

Falls, the whole body of operatives is informed at monthly mass meetings and departmental gatherings of the varying forces affecting the successful operation of the plant. Industrial Democracy tends to train the workers in the actual business of producing goods to supply human need.

Industrial Democracy in most cases also provides an increased income for the workers through profit-sharing and similar plans. Personally, I believe that in established industries capital should receive only a fixed return of five per cent. or six per cent. (guaranteed by a sinking fund) and that the workers by hand or brain should receive not twenty-five or fifty, but one hundred per cent. of all profits over this amount. A man is of more value than a sheep—labor than capital. If this arrangement were general, it would mean vastly increased comfort for the average worker's family and an increased home consumption through increasing the spending power of the nation, which would reduce the pressure for "capturing foreign markets" and minimize the international dangers of our present economic order.

The machinery and the spirit of Industrial Democracy could be projected also into the larger relations between the producer and the consumer. For when once those who produce the world's goods acquire the will, the knowledge, the ability to work together in a cooperative spirit for the common good within each industry, this spirit can be carried into the wider economic sphere; and similar machinery can be set up to insure the same cooperative, rational, constructive relations between the producing public and the consuming public. An Industrial Congress, somewhat similar to that contemplated by certain brands of Guild Socialism, could represent the producing public, and a joint committee of this Industrial Congress and of our present political Congress (representing the consuming public) might work out together questions of prices, quality, etc.—industrial problems in which "the public" of consumers is also vitally interested.

Industrial Democracy offers possibilities of developing a rational method of efficient, democratic control of industry for the common good. Its method is not tinged with coercion. It would not rely even in the last analysis upon the use of force. Its appeal is to the Christian owners of industry voluntarily to give up power and privilege, not of necessity but willingly, in order that the workingman may be no longer a servant but a brother beloved. To deny the possibility of real social change coming thus from on top is to deny the power of Christ. It seems to me that Industrial Democracy makes a special appeal in its method to all men and women of good will. I should like to see more of the thought and effort of Christian pacifists applied to extending and particularly to developing into more radical forms this voluntary movement toward democracy and brotherhood in industry.

100 per cent. Academic

By RUTH McINTIRE

THE speaker of the evening launched his conclusion. From the high school auditorium platform he had addressed an earnest handful, gathered by the leading charity organization of the state, on "Educational Preparation for Life." The men were out-numbered three to one, but as these were professional educators, the deficiency was perhaps made good in terms of quality. In the sixth row left, a shabby, sharp-featured man—probably a skilled mechanic—sat alone.

"That phrase," announced the prominent speaker, "the integrity of the work they do' struck me. Let me illustrate. A certain father came to me a short time ago about his son's education. He told me of the struggle he had had, of the difficulties he had faced in order to give his boys their schooling, and he said this: 'I want them to have an education so that they won't have to work as hard as I have had to.'

"I can not agree with that father. He had the wrong ideal about education. Education, yes—and the more of it the better; but as a way to avoid work, no. If our country is to progress democratically it will be through productive work, and one of the primary objects of public education as I see it is to teach the nobility and the dignity of work. In this way only can our schools and our high schools become the instruments of democracy and not of aristocracy."

The speaker acknowledged the applause, and the chairman, the city Superintendent of Schools, rose, in order, as he explained, to express in a few words that sprung to his lips inspired by the wonderful address of Mr. So-and-So the appreciation of his audience.

"How I wish," said he, "that all the people of this city who have boys and girls in our schools could have been present to hear his words. How I wish that they could work with me and that we could take this beautiful high school, or take another high school with all the facilities that this one has, and put it down there on the west side in the slums of this great city, where all the boys and girls that need learning could get it, as well as the children who are more fortunate. How I wish that we could do here in our city all we'd like to do for all the children, poor as well as rich.

"And now is there anyone who'd like to discuss the subjects that you'll find on your programs? We want to have discussion this evening, and I see some gentlemen here that will have some valuable ideas about these subjects. Will someone start the discussion?"

Silence. Then there was a stir on the sixth row

left, and the rather shabby man was on his feet, speaking brokenly.

"I like to say something, Mr. Clapp. I had children in your school, you know. I like to speak because I have children in school. I'm Russian, an' I had five children to raise, and sixteen-fifty a week. I work in the shop, but I tell you I wouldn't work there if I don't have to, because the children they don't have no chance. I send them all to school, I send them as long as I can, and my oldest girl she have to stop and keep house and care for the others for five year now when their mother died. Some mornings they have to go to school with no breakfast, and they can't learn without nothing to eat. I had five to bring up and only sixteen-fifty, and I tell you they don't have no chance with their father workin' like I do in the shop."

The prominent speaker twirled his thumbs, two of the professional educators conferred aloud together, while the women exchanged glances and then regarded the chairman. The chairman rose, large and paternal.

The Russian continued: "Why is it, I like to know, that I can't give my children as good a chance as other children? I ain't any Red or Bolshevik. I work hard all my life, but I don't get enough to give them an education. You know I send them to school long as I can. Why is it, I like to know? I tell you somebody's gettin' the money I ought to have to educate my children. The people that's keepin' it from me is the people that's makin' money out of us—profiteerin'."

The chairman caught a familiar word. "That's the subject for discussion here tomorrow evening," he interposed. "Yes, we'll talk about profiteering tomorrow. Now the subjects for tonight are—um—Completing the elementary school as a requirement for leaving school under sixteen years of age to go to work, or, Completing the seventh grade, or, Arriving at the fifteenth birthday. Has anybody anything to say about any of those?"

THE WORLD TOMORROW has extended a hearty welcome to labor papers and labor colleges, but to no educational agency of the working class does it extend more good wishes than to the Labor Film Service, Inc., 31 Union Square, New York City. The movies are the great propaganda agency of the future. Labor and the friends of labor cannot afford to see them completely dominated by those who use film plays and the pictorial record of events to buttress privilege. The Service has a chance to service both Truth and Art.

Out Where You Live

An Appeal

By CHARLES T. HALLINAN

OUT where you live, it is August, a month commonly dedicated to vacation, to hammocks

but in Washington the War Plans Division of the General Staff has just completed a survey of our army posts and cantanments—to be submitted to Congress in December—showing what changes would be necessary to adapt them to a system of universal military training.

Out where you live, white woolly clouds drift lazily across a deep blue sky. White clouds; blue sky. Harding seems a bore and Cox no better

but in Washington we learn that some of the leading newspaper correspondents of the country have suddenly been pulled off from the sluggish presidential campaign and have been sent flying across the country to take ship for Japan, on a "hip" from somebody that trouble may develop over there one of these days. In the meantime Secretary Daniels orders a grand gala mobilization of the American navy near the Panama canal. These clouds are insubstantial, perhaps, but they are not woolly, and they are worth watching, even in August.

Out where you live, you develop a sort of mid-summer individualism. You want to be let alone. You don't want to be bossed

but in Washington the Navy Department complacently hands out press statements describing the compulsory military training which, without act of Congress, it has imposed upon our "wards," the helpless inhabitants of Guam—compulsory drill, under penalty of military punishment, for all boys between the ages of seven and sixteen, and compulsory enrollment in the militia between the ages of sixteen and twenty-three.

Out where you live, "father"—prudently estimating first the amount of gasoline he has—genially proposes to "mother" that he get out the car and they take a spin in the evening "to cool off"

but in Washington we have a lobby of American oil men, interested in Mexican oil wells, who confidently argue that when our oil supply gives out, as it will in a few years, and "gas" goes to sixty cents a gallon, "father" will be converted to a belief in intervention in Mexico. In the mean-

time they are working quietly and steadily with our reactionary State Department to lay such a foundation as will make intervention, some day, the "logical" next step.

Out where you live, youth boils all over the place—happy, irrepressible, utterly charming and disarming

but in Washington the War Plans Division of the General Staff, which has taken over the training of the high school boys enrolled in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, proceeds along lines of its own as reflected in the headlines over a dispatch from Camp Custer, Michigan: "Cadets Receive Taste of Gas. Senior R. O. T. C. Companies Given Instruction in Modern Implement of Warfare."

Out where you live, the fight on universal military training is regarded as dead

but in Washington they are not so sure about it. If it were dead, Governor Cox and Senator Harding would have given it safe kicks in their notification speeches, but they didn't; they evaded the issue. If it were dead, the Democratic national convention at San Francisco would scarcely have rejected, with jeers and catcalls, Mr. Bryan's resolution condemning it. If it were dead—instead of being merely shelved until the campaign is over—candidates for Congress would scarcely be as evasive as they are on that question.

But we won't prolong it. Being human, you may begin to resent this fanciful picture of the alleged difference between your carefree August existence and the strenuousness of the Nation's capital! You may feel that you have troubles of your own.

But all we want to do is to remind you that there is somebody on the job here, trying to keep tab on various matters in which you are deeply interested. If you can contrive, before you start off on your vacation, to send a contribution to the treasurer of the American Union Against Militarism, Weston Building, Washington, D. C., you can enjoy your outing with the consciousness that plans are being pushed for lining up as many Congressmen as possible against universal military training.

Our finances, as many of you know, have the endorsement of the National Information Bureau, 1 Madison avenue, New York City, an organiza-

tion which supervises organizations appealing for public funds. Their endorsement means not only that we account properly for moneys received and expended, but that our methods of raising funds are conservative—that we waste no funds in rais-

ing funds. But these restrictions, while wholesome, place the burden of our work solely upon those who approve of our spirit and believe in our goal. Without their help we should have to close our doors and leave the issues entirely to chance.

Open For Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

We are always pressed for space in this portion of the magazine, and perforce omit much valuable correspondence that comes to us. This month, however, we have such a wealth of long and interesting letters that we have yielded to the temptation to print more of them than usual, even at the cost of shortening by two pages our space for regular articles.

On the New Party—and a New World

I WENT to the Chicago convention of the third party, now called Farmer-Labor party, and witnessed its failure to achieve unity with the official elements of the Committee of Forty-Eight. This failure was not a great surprise to me, although in the first days of the convention there were from all sides so many speeches about cooperation, fusion, unity, that I wondered if after all something new and big would not come out of the attempt. Alas, no! The mountain was laboring but brought forth only a mouse. As a result partly of the stubborn stand of the Labor people, the convention adopted a platform, written by the Labor Committee, loaded with a multitude of planks, and, as much as I can remember, differing very little from the platform of the Socialist party, but not as good. What, then, was the use of forming a new party?

The selected name, Farmer-Labor party, suggests class distinction and antagonism, and probably condemns the new party to the impotence which has always characterized the Socialist party in our country because the word "Socialism" suggests antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie, however vague and indefinite this class distinction may be.

But by no means all of the blame should fall on the labor groups. The liberal, individualistic leaders of the Committee of Forty-Eight were evidently very much to blame. For my part, I did not pay much attention to the leaders. I was attracted by the S. Louis platform, with that radical plank of government control of transportation, principal resources, etc. I imagined that the leaders, when advocating a short platform, practically confined to that plank, saw, as I did, that it was the entering wedge for a radical, fundamental reform of the profit system. I do not yet understand how they could advocate that plank and say that they are only liberals, not radicals.

I am convinced that the majority of the Forty-Eighters were radicals, like myself. I have not heard anything but radical talk on all sides, except that bad break of McCurdy's when in his very fine key-note speech he said: "We are not Socialists, we are individualists."

When he said that, I turned to my neighbor, a woman school teacher, and said to her: "Why on earth does he shut the door to Socialists?" She answered: "I do not know; I am a Socialist myself."

The next day I was sitting near another New York delegate—a doctor, I think—and telling him how I considered that a short platform with that radical government-control plank was the best way to begin the fundamental reform which must in the end lead to the abolition of the profit system, and that I saw salvation only in the ultimate abolition of profits. He told me: "I absolutely agree with you. I have been a Socialist for sixteen years, but I notice that the Socialist party remains impotent, that the Big Interests are not afraid of it, pay no attention to it; so I have joined the Committee of Forty-Eight to see if we cannot give to Socialism a new form and a new name."

There you are. Undoubtedly almost everybody in that convention was a radical. There is no room now for liberalism. That means only fooling with symptoms; and if some of the Forty-Eight leaders had only in mind a renewal of the meaningless Bull Moose movement, it is no wonder that the labor men told us flatly that they were suspicious of us.

The trouble is that all these groups, although they have the same general purpose, have no clear understanding of the real cause of the disease which threatens our civilization with disintegration and collapse. They see the symptoms, and imagine that legislation which tinkers with these symptoms will cure the disease. Each group has its particular hobbies. They do not realize that the root of the disease lies in the fact that we work for profit, not for use. They all want a more just distribution of wealth, but do not see that this unequal distribution of wealth is a fundamental, inexorable law of the profit system. No futile legislation, in spots, will change that. And no legislation which does not strike at the root of the trouble will affect that other fundamental law of the system, that profits depend on scarcity in relation to the needs, that we cannot have both profits and abundance, that production on the profit basis will always stop long before the needs of the people are satisfied, will stop as soon as profits tend to vanish.

If there had been in the new party's platform only one plank, the plank of the Committee of Forty-Eight, demanding popular control and government management of transportation, including stock-yards, grain elevators, terminal warehouses, pipe lines and tanks; also of all public utilities and of the principal natural resources; that was a good deal, and it was enough. Of course, such vital issues of the present day as the

abolition of free speech and peaceable assembly by our administration, and our international relations, should have been referred to in the platform; but nothing more was needed, and such a platform would have made of the party a powerful factor in the coming election by enlisting support from all groups of people—not only from workmen and farmers, but from the middle class. The present very bad economic conditions are affecting the middle class as much as the working class. There must be cooperation, and a spirit of conciliation, between the two.

The program outlined above, if carried out, would bring relief to all classes of people as soon as we learned to make government work efficient. There is no difficulty in that provided we secure the services of brainy organizers, of expert production engineers, men of the Hoover type, and do not change them every time that politics change. Able men will easily be found as soon as we pay them the same high salaries which are given them in private business; we shall have to do that as long as we keep the profit system in other activities than government activities. Our government has so far tried to have its work done by underpaid, ordinary men, mostly politicians. The result has been an enormous waste of money, and poor service.

After we have successfully organized the transportation system and the other great public works, it will be time to consider how this organization of profitless work can be extended further. We cannot figure exactly how it will be done, but we see that it is fundamentally wrong to produce for profit, that the apparently ineradicable evils of poverty and war have their roots in that vicious system, that we must sooner or later make a radical change; and we also clearly understand that the only practical way of making that change is gradually to extend profitless government work. Let us make a start by striking at the largest sources of profits; but we should not go further at present, nor waste our time on a jumble of proposed new laws which will not remedy our troubles any more than the innumerable laws we have already passed, because they do not touch the root of the trouble.

I have noticed in your late editorials (I am here getting away from the Chicago convention) that although you see the necessity of abolishing profits, you claim that engineering efficiency will not solve the problem; that there must be something else back of that organization by experts, that is, the spirit of cooperation, the spirit of human brotherhood. It is very true. But these two necessary factors of the transformation will grow together; one cannot develop without the other, and if one is to have precedence, it should be engineering efficiency. As soon as growing efficiency in profitless government work begins to give us a larger production and greater contentment, a high sense of civic duty will more and more become an important factor in our lives. This element, it is true, is badly missing at present, but it is not true to claim that selfishness and greed are fundamental traits of our nature. The spirit of human brotherhood is in us; it is dormant, it manifests itself only occasionally, because it is held in leash by a destructive economic system which forces us—really forces us—to fight each other, to kill each other, in trade or in war. Give free rein to those better instincts of man, and they will bloom as flowers in an arid soil will bloom as soon as we give water to the soil. It would be a mistake to

think that we do not earnestly believe in Christ's message of love, peace, and good-will among men. We do—we are really convinced that, some day, the golden rule will become the real rule of life; but it will not become a reality by simply preaching it. We must first lay the foundations of a new structure, based on cooperation, service, and international good-will. If engineering efficiency can do that (and it alone can do it by organizing profitless production), let us have engineering efficiency first, and let us stop worrying about a spiritual development which will be the natural result of economic progress, of more contented lives, of a larger production and more just distribution of the material things which we need for the sustenance and enjoyment of life.

S. ROBINEAU.

Syracuse, N. Y.

A Word More about Denunciation

MAY I try to set the question of denunciation more plainly for your correspondent, Celia Baldwin, and others who share her thought? The question touches our whole attitude as human beings. What should be our attitude not as animals subject to appetite and passion, nor as children governed by customary social prepossessions, but as thoughtful and purposeful men? The closing words in your correspondent's letter introduce us to the heart of the problem. Referring to certain people, she characterizes "such creatures as enemies of mankind." Probably we have all felt at times like that. Were we at our best when we have felt thus? The words, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do," attributed to Jesus in the face of the grossest cruelty, offer a clue to our thought. A new philosophy, underlying every ideal conception of humanity, is here at hand. This philosophy (or religion) opens the door to the most practical subject of our stormy times, namely, how to forgive. We discover that we must have no enemies. Do you say, 'Impossible'? This is the attitude of children, who still see no harm in following the motions of their animal nature. The new and humane attitude easily sets us quite above this childish disposition.

The idea is very simple. What are we here for, not as animals or thoughtless children, but as men, in some sense children of God? Plainly to serve and help one another in every way possible, as the members of a family, and so doing to share and increase and heighten the value of the life of all. There are among us all stages of growth and of failure to grow; there are the feeble in mind or body, the diseased, the blind and deaf, the depraved and seemingly hopeless, the chronic victims of pride and egotism. Some of us are more mature, having had greater gifts of light and friendship. More mature—how? In only one way: in our friendliness, in patience, in visions of truth, in our will to help and to share the best that has come to us with the others, and likewise to receive in return their human values translated into the common circulation of life. The one beautiful purpose is the law of all success: namely, to turn our best side towards everyone and bring our good will to bear with such intelligence as we can command on every occasion. Failing in this we fail to function as men, and indeed fail to live.

What about those who try our patience, whom

some call our "enemies"? Our new plan of life has no room for enemies. Our attitude is like that of the physician or the nurse to the sick. The physician carries no enmity, but only the will to mend and renew life. There is no difficulty here when once the physician or nurse sees the purpose of his life. There is no difficulty for any of us as soon as we alter our bearing from that of the child unthoughtful still what his business in life is, to that of the man who sees and shares the splendid purpose of the universe, as a son of God.

Denunciation now fall out of use; you have other, finer and more effective means to work with. Denunciation at best was a clumsy, bungling method. The physician does not think of denouncing his patients. He abhors the disease; he is outspoken in pointing out the inhuman conditions that produce and spread disease. His one enterprise is to kill disease, the universal enemy, and to save men. There are no human enemies any more to be denounced.

So far as this attitude prevails, war and every kind of divisive strife disappear. They belong to the realm of sheer animalism. Must not the "strike" thus give way in favor of a humane, rational, and cooperative attitude on the part of everyone who has enlightenment concerning the social purpose of industry?

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Southwest Harbor, Me.

THE July issue of THE WORLD TOMORROW has a communication from Celia Baldwin, who wants violent denunciations abolished and replaced by the sweet spirit of Jesus Christ. This is highly opportune in these days when we have become accustomed to rude and uncivil expressions. It would be highly conducive to our happiness and peace if words like the following were dropped from our vocabulary: nigger, greaser, shoney, and more such rude expressions which wound tender hearts. Christ is the Divine model; hear ye Him, listen not to His enemies. What says the Divine model who cannot err? Learn of me because I am meek and humble of heart. Meekness and humility would change the face of the earth. Pride is mostly the cause of the sorrows of the world.

RAYMOND VERNIMONT,

Catholic Priest.

The Plight of Our Educational System

I READ that article in the *Times* on which you commented in your last issue: "Ettinger Thinks Wolfson Should Go." It made me pretty hot. The article touches upon a question in which I have been now for some years greatly interested: that of separate schools, or parochial schools, though the latter are not the same thing. I have in mind the separate schools which exist in Canada, in Ontario and other provinces under the law, and which participate in the public funds.

Dr. Ettinger, City Superintendent of Schools, in a statement to the Board of Education, speaks of Mr. Wolfson's deeming it proper "to permit his pupils to ballot for a convicted felon." Now this raises sharply, in my mind, the question whether Ettinger is a fit man at all to have anything to do with a system of public education. This, quite admitting that the whole situation is a difficult one. In the first place, an educationist should have some restraint, some fairness, some

sense of proportion. Ettinger's dismissal of Debs as a "convicted felon" in order to build up a case against Wolfson errs in all these points. It would surely be just as fair to dismiss Jesus Christ, most of the Apostles, and a long line of illustrious men and women, including John Bunyan and William Penn, as convicted felons. It seems to me that a strong case against Ettinger as an educationist at all can be made here.

Again on the point of fairness: Ettinger makes no distinction and evidently does not wish for the purpose of his argument to have any distinction made, between a political crime and a crime of violence or theft. Such a distinction has always been made even by the state. Nor does Ettinger desire to have any of the circumstances in which Debs was convicted taken into consideration. Is it not true that several public men, including President Wilson, have said much the things that Debs was convicted for? Debs' crime was at least committed for the benefit of others in the course of conduct which he believed sincerely to be right.

The really staggering part of the article is where Ettinger says that any teacher who "thought that there was no necessity for advocating 'making peace in Berlin'" possessed attributes which would "absolutely disqualify" him from being a teacher.

This seems to me to be a staggering situation when you come to think what it implies. Ettinger is, I understand, an appointee of appointees. Nobody elected him. Yet he is dealing with the children of all the people, the children of the community, regardless of sect, political opinions, or other spiritual adherence. Ettinger knows perfectly well that a large number of parents who send their children to the public schools did not want to see the Allies get to Berlin, did not think it would be a good thing for America, for Germany, or for any country that the Allies should get to Berlin, but a very bad thing indeed. It was not merely pacifists and conscientious objectors or socialists or radicals who believed this, but a considerable number of Americans who had supported the war and whose sons were in it.

But Ettinger, supposed educationist, is prepared to ride rough-shod over the views of all these parents. He demands not merely that a teacher be neutral as regards the Allies' getting to Berlin, but that a teacher spiritually support the get-to-Berlin view. The whole statement of Ettinger indicates astonishing spiritual stupidity and is predicated on the assumption that Ettinger knows better than others what is best for all.

Really, his phase of the situation ought to be emphasized. It is a question we are on the edge of all the time and before long will have to face. I thoroughly believe that the public school will be more and more a failure, and that if the public school system is to continue or be successful we shall have to make definite provision for the conflicting views held by the parents of the children.

Some socialists seem to think that it would be a good thing to capture the schools and start in to teach the children socialist doctrine. That is just as bad as the Ettinger philosophy. In fact, it is precisely the Ettinger plan, with the socialists on top instead of Ettinger. It will never do, because it is just as much coercion of men's minds and consciences as the present system.

I started in Canada in as a strong advocate of public schools. Great scheme! Get all the children of the

community together in an unsectarian atmosphere. Have them grow up together and not know racial and sectarian differences. It has, however, not worked out that way, because the fine idea was based on neither justice nor common sense. Differences of race and religion have to be respected, and any attempt to ignore them or eliminate them by indirect means defeats itself and does not succeed.

A. VERNON THOMAS.

Jesus and the Doctrine of Non-Resistance

IT is quite the common thing for Christian Pacifists to claim the Man of Nazareth as the ideal exponent and example of the doctrine of absolute non-resistance. We assert that we are opposed to war under any and all circumstances, and claim that we could not be Christians and take any other attitude. We believe in the absolute and unqualified superiority of *moral forces over physical forces*; in the power of love over *hate*. Therefore, in loyalty to *principle* we could not support or excuse the World War, or any kind of participation in it.

As we look back upon the "War for Democracy," its aftermath of reaction, international hatred, distrust, and suspicion; its failure to bring about any of those glorious effects for which so many liberals compromised their convictions; we are more than ever convinced of the fact that no question can ever be settled right by a resort to force, violence, war, or compulsion. So we renew our efforts in behalf of the Gospel of Universal Brotherhood and Love, and insist that the world can never be saved until men everywhere consent to *live* the principles and *spirit* of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But are we really and truly justified in our claim that Jesus was an expounder of the doctrine of absolute non-resistance?

We base our contentions for the claim that Jesus was a pacifist not only on the example he set by his own non-resistance to the violence and force of his enemies at the time of his betrayal and arrest, and his rebuke to Peter, "Put on thy sword, for they who take the sword shall perish by the sword," but also on the sayings of the Sermon on the Mount, the parable of the Good Samaritan, the doctrine of the Universal Fatherhood of God and consequent Universal Brotherhood of Man, etc. Triumphantly we quote:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:

"But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

"And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

"And if any man sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that despitefully use you, and persecute you, pray for them that hate you;

"That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven," etc.

We also quote the words of Jesus: "The second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Granting that the burden of the teaching of Jesus Christ is against all use of the weapons of force and violence and war; that pacifism is true to the funda-

mental spirit of the life and example of the Nazarene; that the acceptance of the principle of Universal Brotherhood precludes the possibility of war; granting all that, what are we to do with the saying of Jesus in Matt. 10:34-35: "Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. [38th] And a man's foes shall be they of his own household."

Or, what are we to do with the twenty-third chapter of Matthew where Jesus abuses the Scribes and Pharisees with words that bite like serpents, and sting like adders? Where can we find in any literature a greater tirade of invective, denunciation, and intolerance?

Where is there any parallel in spirit between Matt. 5 and Matt. 23? What can be the conclusion of the whole matter? In persuading men and women of today to meet the issues and problems of modern life in the spirit of Jesus Christ, are we to mean the spirit of Matt. 23 or Matt. 10:34-35, John 2:14-16? By any stretch of the art of "harmonizing the Scriptures" can we call Jesus' forcible ejection of the traders from the temple as non-resistance? as pacifism?

I am just as anxious as anyone to claim Jesus of Nazareth as the supreme authority in ethics, and the ideal exemplar and teacher of the doctrine of absolute non-resistance. I am a believer in the principle of non-resistance to evil. I am a pacifist, and I am definitely convinced that war has not one single good thing to commend it to earnest-thinking Christian men and women. But what I want somebody to prove is this: Are we justified by all the facts of the life of Jesus in our claim upon him as the ideal representative and teacher of our point of view?

Will someone solve this difficulty for me? I confess that I cannot.

CHARLES S. MUNDELL.

Jennings, Okla.

Ex Libris

White Man's Arrogance

Darkwater. By W. A. B. DuBois. (Harcourt Brace & Howe.)

The Rising Tide of Color. By Lothrop Stoddard (Charles Scribner's Sons).

The Shadow. By Mary White Ovington. (Harcourt, Brace & Howe.)

IT is no love of irony or of controversy which leads me to couple together these two antithetical volumes. Profoundly as they differ in their points of view, Dr. DuBois and Mr. Stoddard are agreed in bringing home the desperate importance of the race problem. Each in his own way warns us that the final catastrophe of civilization may be a war of rebellion against white domination.

Darkwater is the work of an artist and prophet. Here are to be found information, argument, poetry, protest, so combined as to present not only the sorrow but the rising anger of a race to whom the white peoples have heedlessly or brutally denied the reverence

each man owes his neighbor by reason of our common humanity. If one lays down the book with a sense of disappointment that in spite of its excellence it somehow misses greatness, at least he cannot easily silence in his ears "the voices from within the veil" who speak through its pages. And if bitterness seems to be the quality which mars the power of Dr. DuBois' appeal, the white man has lost his right to complain.

Mr. Stoddard's book is the work of a pseudo-scientist with a considerable skill in writing who, sincerely enough no doubt, jumbles assumptions and facts in a plausible and dangerous combination. He states clearly the facts of white domination; he shows how precarious are the foundations of white rule in most of Asia and Northern Africa. "Let the brown world once make up its mind that the white man *must* go, and he will go, for his position will have become simply impossible. It is not solely a question of a 'Holy War'; mere passive resistance, if genuine and general, would shake white rule to its foundations. And it is precisely the determination to get rid of white rule which seems to be spreading like wild-fire over the brown world today." He mourns the threatened suicide of the white race through the Great War and unreal peace of Versailles. Finally, he argues that to maintain the supremacy and purity of the white race in its present territories,—Europe, North and South America, South Africa, and Australia,—"we whites will have to abandon our tacit assumption of permanent domination over Asia, white Asiatics will have to forego their dreams of migration to white lands." This with the revision of the wretched Versailles business and the rigorous curtailment even within the white world of importations of "lower human types like those which have worked such havoc in the United States" is his constructive program. In this medley of wisdom and folly are two fundamental errors.

(1). Mr. Stoddard assumes virtually without argument the innate and essential racial superiority of the white race in general and the Nordic race in particular. He prejudices the difficult question of racial psychology and "consciousness of kind" by assuming without adequate evidence that it rests on innate and unalterable biological differences which constitute some races permanently inferior. (This is, of course, the modern "scientific" equivalent of the old theological doctrine that God intended to punish the sins of man by the perpetual slavery of his descendants). For Mr. Stoddard the work of scientists like Ripley and Boas on the subject of race is as if it were not. He ignores the fact that our extreme race consciousness and in particular white arrogance is a modern phenomenon largely non-existent in the ancient world. He indulges in a kind of rhapsody on the extraordinary virtues of the early American stock—a stock which is already vitiated by immigration! As a matter of fact it would be hard to prove historically that the "nascent 'native American race'" (i. e., the Americans up to the Irish immigration of the '40's) was so vastly superior in promise to our present population. Prejudice is bad enough, but prejudice masking as science is ten times more dangerous.

(2) It is natural that an author so obsessed with the fundamental importance of blood should ignore the economic factor in imperialism and in racial development. He is aware of Bolshevism, which he hysterically denounces as "anti-racial" as well as anti-

social. It is "the arch-enemy of civilization and the race" because in its internationalism it seeks economic emancipation of the colored races. It must therefore "be crushed out with iron heels no matter what the cost." War Mr. Stoddard fears because of its "toll on racial values," but better war than Bolshevism. Nowhere is there a flicker of understanding of the real economic forces that make for Bolshevism on the one hand or empire on the other. The consequence of this ignorance of economics is that Mr. Stoddard is in reality a kind of preacher of distorted Utopianism! His program for the supremacy of the white race will be defeated by economic forces. British imperialists will not so readily as he thinks abandon India to save the white race. The danger, then, of Mr. Stoddard's work is not that his program will be carried out but that his mischievous pseudo-science of race will be used to inflame hatreds, to retard a sober study of racial psychology, and to aid the imperialist in checking any real growth of solidarity among the workers of all races. Yet without some such solidarity, Christianity, socialism, human brotherhood, are all a mockery.

N. T.

A WOMAN wrote "Uncle Tom's Cabin," the novel sometimes credited with bringing on the Civil War. It is interesting to find, nearly seventy years later, another woman writing a novel that calls for a new crusade in the interest of the negro, and writing with a wise and gentle tolerance that calls not to passion but to understanding. Mary White Ovington's novel *The Shadow* lets one know what it feels like to be a negro.

As one of the directors of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the author knows all of the brutal and ugly aspects of the race problem in America. She knows, and as readers of her terrible story *The White Brute*, published a few years ago by *The Masses*, will remember, she can write of certain aspects she chooses not to stress in this novel. She is content to write of the Negro simply and understandingly, showing his position and problem in our democracy. Her black characters are drawn lovingly; for she seems to possess in rare combination that sympathetic affection which the Southern white feels for the black when he "keeps his place" together with a comprehension of the aspiring mind and soul of the black race.

The story moves from South to North and touches on labor issues, but it may seem that the author has neglected an opportunity to show the Negro in relation to the economic struggle and the economic element that complicates the race issue in such happenings as the recent Chicago riots. However, to have done so would perhaps have overcrowded a novel that is already rich in incident.

M. K. R.

A Suggestion

One of our Cooperators makes an interesting suggestion. It is that readers of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* might like to constitute a very informal Readers' Club. Those who find books or magazine articles which seem to them significant might send the information to us. From such suggestions we would try to compile lists which would furnish a kind of guide through the maze of print and paper to articles that are especially helpful and informing.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation—Seventh General Conference

will be held at The Inn-in-the-Hills, Highland, New York (opposite Poughkeepsie), from Thursday, September 9th, to Sunday, September 12th, 1920.

Among the speakers will be *Kate Richards O'Hare, Richard Roberts, A. J. Muste, John Haynes Holmes, Robert Whitaker of Los Gatos, California, and Norman Thomas.* Those who are interested in the application of the principles of Christianity to the pressing problems of life, personal, industrial, and international, are invited to attend.

For further information and reservation of rooms apply to the Secretary, Paul Jones, Room 914, 118 East Twenty-eighth street, New York City.

READ THIS

THE BEST WAY TO TELL THE TRUTH IS TO KIDNAP FALSEHOOD.

To all folks who have a sense of humor and can appreciate the absurdities of the present social and economic system, don't miss an issue of:



Edited by Art Young

"TO LAUGH THAT WE MAY NOT WEEP"

Out the 1st and 15th of each month. **GOOD MORNING** is the most fearless, hard hitting pictorial magazine of humor and satire published in America.

GOOD MORNING is not filled with heavy and tiresome reading, but with clever cartoons, bits of verse and brilliant epigrams. You'll want it and will be out of sorts if you don't get it; so fill out the coupon and mail in your subscription today. \$3.50 per year—\$1.00 for three months.

Good Morning Co., Inc., 7 E. 15th St., N. Y. City.
Enclosed please find..... for which send **GOOD MORNING** to

Name.....

Address.....

State.....

T. F. Hastings, Business Manager

Keep your religious thinking abreast of your other thinking

The Christian Century

A Journal of Religion

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON and
HERBERT L. WILLETT, Editors

IN THESE days of great thinking on world themes, constructive leaders must think greatly on Christian themes. A notable series of brilliant and candid articles by leading American thinkers, covering the entire range of typical present-day opinion from orthodox apologetic to radical criticism, is now appearing in *The Christian Century*, on the general subject—

"Will the Church Survive?"

The most significant journalistic effort in the history of the American religious press. Among the writers are:

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson	Dr. Shailer Mathews
Dr. Robert E. Speer	Dr. Horrie Jenkins
Mr. John Spargo	Dr. Edward Serthner Ames
Dr. Joseph Ernest McAfee	Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Mr. Francis Haskell	Dr. W. Douglas Mackenzie
The Hon. Louis F. Post	Mr. Max Eastman
Dr. Graham Taylor	Mr. Carl Sandburg
Prof. Harry F. Ward	Dr. H. D. C. MacLachlan
	and others

The Subscription Price of *The Christian Century* is Three Dollars a Year. New subscribers note two special acquaintance offers in coupons below.

Send your order and money to: Tear off and mail today

Acquaintance Subscription to Jan. 1, 1921, \$2.	Five Months' Acquaintance Subscription, \$1.
<i>The Christian Century</i> , 1400 E. Wabash Ave., Chicago. For the enclosed \$2 please send me <i>The Christian Century</i> , weekly, until Jan. 1, 1921, and a copy of "The Protestant," by Bur- ris Jenkins.	<i>The Christian Century</i> , 1400 E. Wabash Ave., Chicago. For the enclosed \$1 please send me <i>The Christian Century</i> for a trial period of 5 months (22 issues).

Name

Address

.....

THE WORLD TOMORROW STILL
NEEDS \$1,000 FOR ITS GUARAN-
TEE FUND FOR THE CURRENT
YEAR.

WANTED!

A Theological Student for Religious Education.

In connection with Religious Forums being conducted within New York City an experiment is about to be conducted in religious education among radical boys and girls. If the right theological student can be found to co-operate with the Director named below, \$400 (\$50 per month) is forthcoming as his remuneration.

Qualifications:

1. He should have taken or take at the time of doing the field work two or more courses in Religious Education.
2. Together with his studies, he is required to limit his attention to this experiment, in which he is supposed to spend not more than fourteen hours per week.
3. He should be a pacifist or a near-pacifist, as well as a radical.

If interested apply to

REV. CLARENCE V. HOWELL,
Director of Religious Forums,
44 Monmouth Ave., Edgewater, N. J.



^BThe World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 10

OCTOBER, 1920

15 Cents

Religion and Revolution

By C. Delisle Burns

What is Wrong in Profits?

By C. F. Dole

Vignettes from Germany Probing the Irish Problem

A Political Symposium

By Senator Pat Harrison, Democrat
Dudley Field Malone, Farmer-Labor
Jessie Wallace Hughan, Socialist

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents for the October Issue.

	Page.
Religion and Revolution. By C. Delisle Burns	291
Signs of the Times	295
A Political Symposium. By U. S. Senator Pat Harrison, Democrat; Dudley Field Malone, Farmer-Labor, and Jessie Wallace Hughan, Socialist	298
What Is Wrong in Profits? By C. F. Dow	301
A Socialist Answers. By Norman Thomas	303
Vignettes From Germany	306
Probing the Irish Problem	310
Conferences That Look Forward	317
Great Democracies and Petty Democracies. By G. Arbelaz	317
Open for Discussion	317
The Last Page. By the Wayfare	317

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. October, 1920. No. 10

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publisher,
115 East 28th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hulgsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevil Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gove Hambidge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fisher, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Mellish, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.75. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 115 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 4, 1915, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

C. DELISLE BURNS is an English author and lecturer in the University of London. He has been a student both of theology and of labor conditions.

PAT HARRISON, United States Senator from Mississippi, is Chairman of the Speakers' Bureau of the Democratic National Committee.

DUDLEY FIELD MALONE, former Collector of the Port of New York, advocate of woman suffrage, is Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor of New York.

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN, public school teacher, author of standard books on Socialism, is Socialist candidate for Lieutenant-Governor of New York.

CHARLES F. DOLE, author and clergyman, has long been known for his earnest advocacy of peace and justice.

EVELYN SHARP is an English journalist who has been engaged in Friends' relief work in Germany.

ESTHER WHITMARSH PHILLIPS has already found appreciative readers of her verse. She and her husband are studying conditions in Great Britain and Ireland, and she is acting as correspondent for THE WORLD TOMORROW.

KATHLEEN WHITAKER was for two years office secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in the United States. She has now returned to England and next year will engage in Friends' relief work in Germany.

G. ARRAIZA is a South American journalist, born in Peru, who has followed his profession also in the Argentine Republic. He is now a resident of New York.

When People Get Back From Vacations

In the Fall is the time to push circulation. This Fall, too, it is just before a national election, with interest in political and social questions at white heat.

Therefore we again want you to help us in increasing the circulation of THE WORLD TOMORROW next month—November. It's a simple matter for you. Just decide which of your friends you think might subscribe. Then write us how many extra copies of THE WORLD TOMORROW you want for personal distribution to these friends. We will send you the copies free of charge. And we shall try to make the November issue especially suitable for this purpose. Of course, we still want the names of interested persons to whom we can send copies from our office. But your personal touch counts.

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Prices at these books are subject to change by the publisher.

Darkwater, W. A. B. Dubois (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	2.00	Maureen, Patrick MacGill (McBride) ..	2.00
The Rising Tide of Color, Lothrop Stoddard (Scribner) ..	2.00	Life of General William Booth, Harold Begbie (Macmillan) ..	10.00
Our Great War and the Great War of the Aegean, Greeks, Gilbert Murray (Thomas Selter) ..	1.25	Now It Can Be Told, Philip Gibbs (Harper) ..	3.00
Bolshevism at Work, W. T. Goode (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	1.00	The Judgment of Peace, A. Leites (Harvard) ..	1.75
The Russian Republic, Colonel Malans (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	1.00	The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan) ..	3.00
"Barbarous" Soviet Russia, Isaac McBride (Thomas Selter) ..	2.50	The Bishop and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan) ..	2.00
The Unfinished Program of Democracy, Richard Roberts (B. W. Huebsch) ..	2.00	The Chorus Girl and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan) ..	2.00
What the Workers Want, Arthur Gleason (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	4.00	A Short History of the American Labor Movement, Mary Beard (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	1.50
Facts and Fabrications About Russia, Evans Clark (Rand School, N. Y.) ..	.50	New Ventures of Faith, edited by Gilbert A. Beaver (Association Press), paper, 10c; boards ..	.60
The Central Conspiracy, Ralph Chaplin ..	.50	National Ideals in the Old Testament, Henry Cadbury (Scribner) ..	1.75
Useful Wild Plants, Charles Francis Saunders (McBride) ..	\$2.00	The Shadow, Mary White Orington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe) ..	2.00
		Utmost Papers, Randolph Burns (B. W. Huebsch) ..	1.50



The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 10

OCTOBER, 1920

15 Cents

Religion and Revolution

By C. DELISLE BURNS

IN every country in the world the professed adherents of Religion are the most convinced and earnest opponents of Revolution; and in most countries the revolutionaries hate and despise what goes by the name of Religion.

The problem, then, is to explain the antagonism of those who are governed by each of these enthusiasms, and from that explanation to derive a reasonable attitude and a plan of action, for the issues involved cannot be neglected with impunity. A revolution which neglects religious passions or even religious organizations will end either in futility or in full reaction; religion which discounts the popular desire for radical social changes will die of inanition or become the plaything of imbeciles.

It is apparent that religion and revolution are opposed, and appearances in this case at least are not deceptive. It is possible for the religionist to say that not one of the prophets of revolution was an adherent of an established church. Marx and Morris may be counted by the orthodox as damnable and perhaps damned atheists; and even Rousseau, Mazzini and Tolstoi, all of whom professed to be deeply religious and indeed Christian, are not and were not in their own days accepted as religious by the chief advocates of religion. Obviously the orthodox can prove that the revolutionary is ill at ease in the atmosphere of religion even if he does not altogether depart out of it.

On the other hand, the revolutionary, impatient at the little effect which lofty religious sentiments have had, can point effectively to the fact that no accepted and orthodox leader in religion has transformed the social circumstances of his time and country. Luther secured the belief in justification by faith, but he enslaved the German peoples to petty princes. St. Francis loved men, but left the rich to grind the faces of the poor. Wilberforce, a smaller man than these, but typical of the minor religionism of England, put out a doctrine of sub-

mission which would have excused any revolution.

Thus chapter and verse can be found in history for proving that there is a natural opposition between religion and revolution.

The contrasts to be found in history are still to be found in our present society. Religion is now organized in churches and sects; and there is no church or sect which does not officially condemn revolution. The Roman Church under Leo XIII showed a tendency to approve of democratic movements, and the Encyclical of that Pope, called *Immortale Dei*, provided a cover for *rapprochement* between the Catholics and the French Republic. But even Leo XIII was very careful to teach the lower orders their duty of obedience to their masters; and the flirtations between clerics and liberals have come to an untimely end. The Russian Church, the other great religious atavism, was, according to the newspapers, enlisted in the service of Kolchak and Reaction. The Church of England, of its very nature an upper-class organization in dependence on the capitalistic state, has pronounced its ineffective horror at radical changes in society; and the various organizations of Protestantism, which during the war provided in Germany religious enthusiasm for a Kaiser's war, have kept an ominous silence on the enthusiasms of revolutionary Germany. Even the Society of Friends, some groups of which were able to protest against a popular war, is unable to pronounce in favor of a change which will destroy the profits on which its funds depend.

Organized religion may be condemned for all this; but the advocates of revolution are not secure from a similar criticism. In the preface to such criticism may be written Vauvenargues' saying—"Not all who scoff at auguries are wiser than those who believe in them"; for if we suppose that a radical transformation of society is desirable, why all the orthodox economics of the revolution-

aries? It matters very little whether economic theory is a reflection of facts or a new theological myth for the satisfaction of those simple-minded persons who pride themselves on being "scientific." The fact is that the economic theory of revolutionaries is beside the point. The only motive force for revolution which could possibly be effective would be more absorbing than an economic want; but many of those who make the movement which we call revolution are blind to the greatest passions which stir the human race. They are like Comte in face of metaphysics; for as that worthy failed to understand what metaphysics dealt with, and therefore naturally thought it was almost nothing at all, so the old-fashioned rationalist thinks that dogma and ritual are almost nothing at all, since they have no bearing on what he understands. The neglect of religious organizations is another charge against the revolutionary; for even if religion itself is hateful, it is unreasonable to neglect the existence of the institutions and organization to which it has given rise.

This apparently natural opposition between religion and revolution can be explained by a psychological account of the two attitudes involved. One of the characteristics of the religious attitude is that it is a facing towards the past. The saints and heroes are among the dead: the moral code and the very phrases of religious morality are ancient. We are born into them, and do not make them for ourselves. The Fathers appear to be more reverend than their future descendants.

In very early times the belief was common that an earlier was a happier and more virtuous age, for the Earthly Paradise is among the myths of nearly all religions; and the history of man is commonly conceived as a falling away from an original purity. But apart from myth or dogma, the past is undoubtedly active, and historical events and characters do actually play a great part in shaping the moral standards and exciting the emotions of the religious. This is psychologically to be explained by the fact that the past in memory has always a certain glamor. It is fixed, and, in a sense, perfect by contrast to the ever-changing present; and it has therefore the quality of eternity. The past surrounds us everywhere, while the present by contrast seems trivial and the future hypothetical. In memory one's childhood seems to be a time of happy freedom; and the small pains of those days are forgotten. The experience of many concides here, and thus a form of social myth arises applied to common life in the belief that childhood is a happy time; applied to politics and conversation in the praise of the good old times, the old leaders, the old school, and other such mythology; and in the great enthusiasms of religion applied to the whole universe in the creed concerning a Paradise and a Fall of Man.

This sense of the past induces reverence and

acquiescence in the past, which is of such a character that it cannot be affected by any action of ours. Therefore the habit grows out of religion that one should cherish what is inherited and one should hesitate in doubt of the effectiveness of any action which might change it. Religion, in this sense and for no mean or trivial reason, is opposed to radical and rapid changes, and any revolution which neglected this common human feeling for the past is fated to end in a reaction. Thus the French Revolution introduced the worship of Reason, repudiated the old tradition, and brought on itself—de Maistre and Chateaubriand and the neo-Catholics.

Secondly, genuine religion has always implied a certain aloofness from every-day experience. True religion, it has been said, is to keep oneself unspotted from "the world"; and in the purest form of religion the utmost condemnation is implied in saying that a man is "worldly." But the religious attitude involves not only a moral aloofness; it implies also a view of life and the universe which explains this aloofness. The common life of every day is contrasted with another and better, for the sake of which men should live. The other world is not an empty dogma but a present reality to such men as St. Francis and St. Bernard, and perhaps to Calvin and Luther. To suppose, with the opponents of dogma, that there is only one world simplifies to the point of misrepresentation. It is as though one believed color to be unreal because a camera does not record it; for there are in ordinary experience many worlds, as distinct as the earth and the moon. When the starving beggar on the road, falling asleep in despair, smiles in his sleep, he lives in another world; and walking on the plainest of pavements on the most miserable quest of money or pleasure, a man may be seen to be as it were in a dream, thinking perhaps of lands he will never see or days he will never know; then, although his boots click on the stones, he is in another world. Therefore no reasonable objection can be taken to the idea of another world, whatever may be said as to the evidence of its characteristics.

There is, no doubt, a kind of life or thought to be found within or beyond the daily commonplace which reduces to insignificance much that is commonly accepted as valuable or important. A man secure in that life is not easily enticed by wealth or fame or power; and religion often depends upon a sense of that other world. But in such a world the economics of the revolutionary are folly, and even the physical evils which undeniably exist appear to be trivial. Such facts as these may explain why religion appears to be opposed to revolution.

Revolution by contrast implies looking forward. Its life is impatience, while the life of religion seems often to be patience. The world for the revolutionary is an untried experiment. He feels that

men do not know what is best, and can only discover it by audacity. For him the future holds the greatest men and the society most worthy of our efforts; and therefore he judges his actions and those of his contemporaries not by reference to the saints and heroes of the past, but by contrast with the unachieved social order in which men will at last be men indeed.

The earlier revolutionaries were moralists. They spoke of what ought to be, and were half doubtful whether it ever would come into existence. But the later revolutionaries believed that the coming of this world of their hope was inevitable, for they firmly believed not only that the better social order should exist, but that it would come into existence as part of the process of evolution. To some of their critics this appeared to be a weakness in their argument, for why should one trouble to assist evolution, and why should one be impatient for what must inevitably follow the stern rules of necessity? Nevertheless, the argument for action held good, because the scientific revolutionaries argued that the evolutionary process could be made more speedy, and they very dimly have conceived a philosophical, or rather theological, paradox, as old as the days of the predestination controversy, that what is inevitable may be so only because our own will is part of the process and its desires are inevitable. The future thus becomes to the revolutionary as much present as the past is to the religionist.

Again, revolution is immersed in the immediate. Dreams of a paradise far off will not delay the man who knows that he wants to abolish quite definite and obvious evils. He sees the miserable homes and mean streets, and would make an end of these, building Jerusalem here, and leaving it to others to find a Jerusalem in heaven. He feels the enslavement of the poor, and would have them stand at their full height, free men. He hates the barren and desolating tyranny of the rich, and would topple them down at once without stopping to think whether anyone will pick them up. This appears to be as far as possible removed from the attitude of those who endure to live in an evil world for the sake of heaven after death. The belief in heaven has often been criticised by the revolutionaries because it was supposed to make idealists careless of actual present-day forces, and whether or not the charge is valid, the revolutionary is certain that what is here and now is the most worthy of attention. In the best form of this revolutionary gospel the common things of the world are believed to be the actual stones of the City of God. The world is beautiful and full of wonder, more full, indeed, than our imagination can fill any heaven: the evil with which we contend is the disorder, the discord, obstructing what is natural; and therefore the work of the true revolutionary appears to be not destructive but a removal of unes-

sentials in order that life may be free to show itself for what it is. He works in mean streets for the gold that is there, not for an after-death in some other and alien sky.

Religionists, then, and revolutionaries—as these two terms have hitherto been used—are moved by contradictory tendencies. They face different ways, and each would take the world with them. In a sense they are irreconcilable. No reasonable man would attempt to reconcile opposites, for the world is so wide that opposites may exist without any reconciliation; and there will always be some religious men who genuinely hate revolutions, and some revolutionaries who despise all forms of religion.

Religion and revolution are, after all, abstractions. The fact is that there are religious men and there are revolutionaries, and there are some men in whom the two forces contend. If the nature of these forces is such as described above, the attitude to be adopted is clearly one of acquiescence and interest: for we cannot afford to shut our eyes to either, and there is nothing more plainly of importance at present than these two. But an attitude so adopted involves action; for in such issues living men cannot be mere spectators. The task calls for hands. Enthusiasm is running to waste; and men inspired by ideals are obstructing the very transformation which they desire, because their enthusiasm does violence to that of their fellows. What action, then, can be taken?

The principle of action is based on the discovery that neither religion nor revolution are yet fully developed, and that the psychological attitudes described above should lead further. If Revolution and Religion are each driven to their logical conclusions, they are no longer in conflict, although they still continue to differ. Diverse men will be moved by each; and in any one man who has glimpses of both, the divergent moods no longer contend, but each, as it were, inspires the other.

Religious enthusiasm may be redirected by the perception that, although the past is golden, it is dead. That which is called God is living—even, it may be, unborn; for if man is not all he might be, then God is not; and if the word "God" will not hold the meaning here intended, it will inevitably be repudiated by all who are genuinely moved by religion. "Ah, Zarathustra," said the old Pope, "I see that it is your piety which forbids you to believe in God!" But the living God of the religionist is not a mere personification of the Future of the revolutionary. He is all that is Past, gathered up and projected into a continually growing experience. He is, in fact, He that is to come—a second time.

As for the other world, if the conception is clearly developed it follows that we are divided from it not by being alive, but by low intelligence and feeble emotions, blinding us to facts. It is in the recesses

of the common and heavenly world of here and today that the other world lies. The enemies of true religion are not the atheists and agnostics, but those who, professing religion in whatever form—Christianity, Buddhism, Islam—have not so much as caught a glimpse of the light that never was on land or sea. Among these are the theologians, who argue about Virgin Birth and the Real Presence when women and children are tortured in the mills and the poor lack bread. Blind fools, hearing it said that the poor are blessed, have supposed that poverty was admirable or that the poor should be contented; but what really makes the poor blessed is the part of them that is not poor and not contented. That part is of the make of heaven. Such religion is revolution.

And now let the argument be of revolution. Of revolution many adverse things are said, few of them true and most of them irrelevant. If revolution will put up the cost of coal, what of it? The cost does not matter half so much as who gets the money, and can we not bear to pay a little more that other men may have liberty? But a revolution which swept the past aside would be more barbarous than the tyranny it dethroned. What fool was it who said we should live for future generations, and implied in his conceit that his fathers had lived for him? This is indeed a folly of revolutionary Futurism. Each generation, each man, exists in his own right with his own blood and spirit; he does not borrow either, nor did his fathers lend him either. They had and kept their own; and therefore it would be a vile new world if men entering it forgot the blood and tears which found the sacred way. No sane revolutionary can treat the world as though it should be abolished and entirely remade by his success. In this sense the past is not dead. The conclusion so argued will put hesitation upon the hands of revolution and perhaps a little silence on the lips of revolutionaries. It need not make cynics of revolutionaries, but the vision of the generations may perhaps reduce to their true comic stature the violences of those who would "uplift" us.

Again, it has been already shown that a real revolution cannot be based upon economics or even upon politics, but only upon a social idealism vaster than can be inspired by the desire for commodities or for laws. In fact, the revolutionary must believe in "another" world in order to establish a world worth having.

The perception that conclusions lead further than where the premises stand has sometimes induced a belief in paradox. It has been felt that every obvious truth can be confronted with a contradiction equally true and the habit of turning platitudes upside down has grown upon modern literature. But the argument so far outlined should not be thought to end in paradox. Religion is still one thing and revolution another; and they have

each a world to conquer. Their development is not as pale and ghostly allies in a universal "uplift," but as diverse elements in a life somewhat fuller and more humane than ours. And since the subject here is chiefly revolution in its prelude, the conclusion of the piece stands thus:

Revolution will secure nothing but dust and ashes unless it digs deeper than any grievance. Whatever metaphor will least misrepresent the task of transformation, clearly the foundations are what matter most in the new building; the roots are where the Tree of Heaven springs to life. Therefore the immediate need is for a policy the reverse of superficial. Legislation, strikes, agitation are all very well; but these things are not of the blood and spirit which transform the world.

It is, of course, entirely beyond the scope of this article to define in detail the policy which will lead to a radical improvement in social conditions and individual character. Probably that policy is complex and involves many different actions in the sphere of religion, politics, culture, and economics; but the one purpose must be clear in all the details and the method. The ideal is not merely a new organization of society, but a *finer type of individual character*. The great man is he to whom his fellows owe their happiness, and their happiness is their ability themselves to make others happy. The hero is obsolete. The saint is perhaps somewhat faded. We need a new ideal man; for ultimately our policy will depend upon the sort of person whom we desire to see in existence, and not simply on a plan for bettering the lives of such persons as ourselves.

In regard to social organization, on the other hand, the fundamental need is an ability to see the social effects of our actions. We must see not only the happiness of the person who wears a fine dress, but the miseries of those who made it, not merely the outward calm of our city life, but the oppression on which it depends, and we must be able to feel such evils not merely out of sympathy but as an offense. Out of that perception a social ideal arises as a vision of a new order in which all men have freedom. The enthusiasm which may result and may inspire action, if it is to cause any radical betterment of human life and character, will be much more correctly described as religious than as revolutionary, unless at that stage the two words are almost equivalent in meaning. Therefore the most important element in the influence of the great revolutionaries is their religious or quasi-religious enthusiasm, and not their economic theory; and therefore one of the chief tasks of the moment is to keep the vision of the ideal in the midst of all the economics and politics by which it may be realized. The new social order has long been hoped for, and those who were its prophets have died without seeing their promised land; but past failure is not a proof that success is impossible, and perhaps the world is now ready for a great experiment.

Signs of the Times

A Hint for the Doubtful Voter

A PARTICULARLY dull campaign drags its weary length. Practice makes neither of the candidates very expert as thinker or speaker. Cox is perhaps a bit more aggressive and has a little more respect for the English language, but he has contributed almost as little as Senator Harding to the sum total of human wisdom. His effort to make the main issue of the campaign the amount of money the Republicans wanted has come to very little. He has proved nothing more than what everybody knows, namely, that both the big political parties want all the money they can get and that they use promoters' methods to get it. Under these circumstances the citizen who is neither stand-pat on one side nor socialistically minded on the other is in for an uncomfortable time making up his mind what to do. The Socialists and near-Socialists know. To the others we offer this bit of advice: There are times when a protest vote counts. This emphatically is such a time. Even if one is not a Socialist or a laborite, a vote for Debs or Christensen will count as a warning to the politicians and their masters. Furthermore, there are Congressmen to be elected as well as Presidential candidates, and a little timely insistence might secure from some local Congressmen pledges against intervention in Mexico, against universal military training and service, and against further attacks on American liberty. Unless we want to see the politicians and profiteers put over a Mexican war, conscription and all the rest, after the election, using either or both parties as their tool, just as they have done during the last four years, the electors ought to shake off their apathy long enough to bring vigorous pressure to bear on Congressional candidates.

Repudiating Representative Government

THE New York Assembly ran true to form when it again ousted Messrs. Claessens, Waldman and Solomon, who, together with the two other ousted Assemblymen, had been re-elected in the special election by increased majorities over their fusion opponents. Some of the leaders, both Republican and Democrat, felt the political inexpediency of this action and would have preferred to see all five Assemblymen seated. At last, after a lot of political jockeying, the Assembly by a bi-partisan vote reached a compromise whereby the three gentlemen we have mentioned were expelled while the other Socialist Assemblymen, Messrs. Orr and DeWitt, were seated. The alleged reason for the distinction was that while certain minor changes in the Socialist constitution meant that the party itself was no longer on trial as in the former ouster proceedings, Messrs. Claessens, Waldman

and Solomon, who had served in previous legislatures, had personal records bad enough to warrant their expulsion. The charge is as false as it is absurd. Assemblyman Martin McCue, ex-saloon-keeper and prizefighter and defender of "home and country" in opposition to Socialism, very properly denounced the political hypocrisy of those who sponsored it. Messrs. Orr and DeWitt, when their three comrades were finally expelled, immediately resigned in protest against the attempt to obscure the real issue of representative government by an utterly false distinction. All five of the Socialists, to their everlasting credit, refused to apologize for any of their acts or beliefs or to appear before the Assembly as supplicants for favor. They took their stand on sound principles of representative government. They asserted their responsibility for their opinions to their constituents and not to the Assembly. However indignant the Socialists may feel at the action of the Assembly, as *Socialists* they have no cause to mourn. This new act of contempt for the popular will can only further advance their cause. Still less will those who are saying that progress can only come by direct action or violent revolution mourn over what happened in Albany. In a country which achieved its independence in a violent revolution whose slogan was "Taxation without representation is tyranny," it may be a dangerous thing for profiteers and politicians flagrantly to deny the will of the people. In the interest of peaceful progress no less than of justice, citizens of every economic viewpoint must rebuke this new act of lawlessness at Albany. And they must not content themselves with rebuking it—they must raise the standard of legislative intelligence to higher levels. What can you expect in the way of housing or any other reform from a Legislature which begins operations by so flagrant a repudiation of every principle of representative government?

Repentance a Vain Hope

SOME of us had hoped that the Wilson administration would have a kind of death-bed repentance and return at least to a moderate degree of liberalism. But the time grows late and the acts of our government departments show few signs of grace. Omitting any discussion of the iniquity of the war we wage on Soviet Russia by "moral" and economic pressure, here is a partial record:

The Shipping Board has recently withdrawn from an arbitration agreement with the longshoremen. This is nothing less than a breach of faith because the longshoremen were asked and agreed to forego certain strategic advantages gained during the war on a promise of a permanent arbitration agreement.

Mr. Roosevelt, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, if press despatches are correct, has been boasting of the excellence of the Haitian Constitution, which he says he wrote. His boast is untimely. James Weldon Johnson in *The Nation* has recently presented striking evidence of inefficiency and cruelty in the American administration of Haiti. Virtual slavery has been introduced for the building of roads, and the whole government, he charges, is "of, by and for" the National City Bank. Senator Harding has taken up the criticism of the Democratic administration, and at last stung into action, the Navy Department announces that some time ago it instituted a double investigation, first into the conduct of the marines and secondly into the truth or falsity of the charges that the National City Bank has received special favors in connection with Haitian finances. It is to be hoped that this investigation, which is long overdue, will be more than a white-washing expedition.

Attorney General Palmer, who has been very quiet ever since his efforts to save the country from the Reds failed to secure him the Presidential nomination, has again spoken. This time it is to repeat the familiar old sophistries in extenuation of the government's course in refusing amnesty to Debs and the other political prisoners. Incidentally, his statement that there are only a few such prisoners rests on a wholly arbitrary definition of the term.

Postmaster General Burleson has announced that he will appeal from the decision against him rendered by Judge Hitz of the District of Columbia in the suit brought by the New York *Call* to compel restoration of its second-class mailing privilege. The Judge decided what every man with common sense knows, namely, that there is no freedom of the press whatever if a postmaster-general at his own whim can indefinitely deny a paper second-class mailing privileges, thereby crippling if not altogether killing it—simply because he objected to what that paper had once published. The New York *Call* is not his only victim, but other Socialist papers also are denied second-class privileges, and in some cases, under the espionage law, are not even allowed to receive first-class mail addressed to their editors.

The Secretary of War still holds in prison thirty-six conscientious objectors whose offense is no whit different from that of their comrades who are free. The most dramatic case is that of Ben Salmon, Roman Catholic religious objector to war. On July 13th he began a hunger strike at Fort Douglas as a protest against continued confinement of conscientious objectors. He was brought by the government to St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D. C., where he is confined with the criminal insane. It is, one supposes, an illustration of the official sense of humor that he, a man whose offense is his refusal to take life, should be confined

with those who have tried to take life. His former comrades and those who have visited him scoff at the idea of any insanity. Mr. Salmon is mechanically fed. He refuses to take food; at the same time, his philosophy does not permit him violently to resist the effort of the government to keep him alive. Nevertheless, such mechanical feeding can hardly keep him from death indefinitely. It would be interesting to get the thought of those Roman Catholics who have so persuasively and vehemently argued that the heroic Lord Mayor MacSwiney is not committing suicide on the stand of their American co-religionist who also, in his own way, stands for freedom.

Injustice for Anthracite Miners

THE principle of arbitration in industrial disputes got a very black eye in the recent decision of the anthracite coal commission awarding to the miners a wage increase of 17 per cent. The decision was, of course, not unanimous, the miners' representative dissenting emphatically. It is unjust for the following reasons: (1) In the bituminous fields, certainly not more difficult to work, the miners had already been awarded a 27 per cent. increase, and their anthracite comrades were entitled to equally just treatment. To quote Mr. W. Jett Lauck: "This award is unjust. The anthracite miners are asked to accept a minimum wage of \$4.20 a day as contrasted with \$6 a day for bituminous miners recently granted by a federal commission, which has been increased by agreement to \$7.50 in Illinois and to \$6.75 or \$7.00 in Ohio and Pennsylvania." (2) The coal commission, again by a majority vote, had decided that it was not competent to hear facts about profiteering in the industry, yet these facts were vitally connected with any just determination of wages. (3) In anticipation of wage increases the mine owners had raised the price of coal a dollar a ton although the wage increase would not have amounted to more than fifty cents a ton. Again quoting Mr. Lauck: "However, this does not tell even half the story. The \$1.00 advance at the mines has been multiplied many times. Anthracite for domestic use sold in Washington at \$11.80 a ton prior to May 1. Today it is quoted at \$15.50 a ton, or an advance of \$3.70 a ton. In other cities still larger advances have been made." In other words, the operators are victimizing the consumers as much as the producers. It is also charged that the mine owners have deliberately kept production in the anthracite fields at a minimum all summer, anticipating labor troubles. They wanted to avoid having a stock of coal on hand, so that they could raise the cry of coal famine in order to win public sympathy. Is it any wonder in view of these facts that the miners rebelled at accepting the decision? Rather, is it not wonderful that any of them had such loyalty

to a contract entered into for them by their leaders that they should agree to abide by so unjust a decision? It cannot be too often repeated that few forms of ownership and operation are more ethically indefensible or economically wasteful than the private ownership of the coal fields. It is time for the public and the miners to make common cause to end this evil.

The Wall Street Tragedy and Its Lessons

THE shadow of the frightful tragedy in which thirty-four people were killed and over 200 injured by a terrific explosion at the corner of Broad and Wall streets still hangs over New York. A sense of pity and horror is universal. The consensus of opinion is that a bomb or infernal machine was responsible. Yet the evidence seems far less conclusive than newspaper headlines would make out. Whatever later investigation may discover, certain things may be said with definiteness now.

1. There is something shockingly remiss about a system which either permits explosives to be carted along Wall Street at the noon hour or which allows them to fall into the hands of insane criminals capable of making a bomb powerful enough to do the damage which was wrought in the financial district.

2. Such futile terrorism as that implied by a bomb explosion at noon at the corner of Broad and Wall streets is emphatically contrary to the philosophy and tactics not only of the Socialist Party, which has made its opposition to violence clear, but also of the I. W. W. Even the Communist groups, which, having been driven underground by Attorney General Palmer's tactics, proclaim their faith in violent revolution, utterly reject such individual and senseless terrorism as is implied in bomb-throwing and assassination. All these groups and parties have everything to lose and nothing to gain from the kind of violent reaction against them which terrorism would produce.

3. There is something ghoulish about the disposition of newspapers and politicians to seek to capitalize the tragedy for their own ends. Not merely are the papers seeking to use it to discredit "Socialists and parlor Bolsheviks" for stirring up discontent against this best of all possible governments, but they have even gone so far as to use it in the campaign between Republicans and Democrats. The New York *Tribune* darkly hints that Democratic agitation is somehow responsible for unbalancing feeble minds. Mr. Moore of the National Democratic Committee and the New York *Times* are even more sure that it is Republican agitation which is to blame by reason of its appeal to the discontented.

4. It is of the utmost importance that if the explosion was caused by a bomb the criminal should be detected, but it does not further the detection of

the criminal or protect society from further outrage to launch a new campaign of hysteria against the "Reds" such as followed previous bomb outrages. The public should not forget that in spite of reported clues and tremendous headlines nothing at all ever came of the last "Red roundups" except injustice, which leaves behind ranking hatreds. The clearest lesson that history teaches is that ruthless repression causes more terrorism than it cures.

The Solution of the Housing Problem

THE public press is filled with discussion of the housing situation and how to relieve it. All sorts of factors are blamed for our plight; labor, we are told, is careless and unreasonable; there is a corner in building materials; the money market is tight; private capital can be better rewarded in other lines of industry, etc., etc. Remedies corresponding to the diagnosis are suggested. They range from advocacy of fresh legal action against profiteers (which has never proved successful) to making housing a public utility under municipal control. Exemption of mortgages is frequently advocated. But the singular fact is that save for an occasional letter from a Single-taxer or Socialist the fundamental question of the ownership of land is never discussed. Is it not absurd that when New York City alone needs more than 100,000 new apartments the right of private owners absolutely to control land not merely for use but for speculation goes virtually unchallenged? These owners have left about 45 per cent. of the area of New York City unbuilt upon. What is the economic or political justification for a system under which land necessary to our life is monopolized by a mere handful of landlords, who are the beneficiaries of great increases in value which they have done nothing or next to nothing to bring about? To say that in many cases the landlord loses is no more ethical justification of our system than is the argument that the gambler does not always win. If land were taxed at its full rental value and improvements upon it taxed, if at all, at a much lower rate, it would be impossible to hold land for speculative purposes and building would be stimulated; or, to state the matter in technical language, the first step towards solving the housing problem is the expropriation of the economic rent of land—not the buildings on it—by society, to whom it belongs. Had a decent land policy been in operation, the worst of this disastrous housing shortage might have been avoided. The enactment of a proper land tax law is the first and fundamental step in any housing reform. If to this law were added an emergency measure permitting municipalities under certain conditions to acquire land and to erect houses the immediate crisis would be met as well as is possible under a system in which the profit motive is dominant.

A Political Symposium

THE WORLD TOMORROW has made an effort to secure an unbiased and adequate symposium on political parties and candidates. Despite many requests to individuals and to the National Committee itself resulting in the promise of an article, we have received no statement from a Republican source. Perhaps the Republicans consider THE WORLD TOMORROW an unsatisfactory medium for setting forth their case; perhaps they are so confident of victory that it does not seem to them necessary to argue the matter. On our part, we frankly regret the omission of any Republican statement.

The Paramount Issue from the Democratic Standpoint

By United States Senator

PAT HARRISON

ON the Democratic side in this campaign for the Presidency, the issues are clearly and unmistakably defined. They are defined in the platform adopted at San Francisco and they are emphasized unmistakably and without quibble or equivocation by the candidates for President and Vice-president on the Democratic ticket. There is and has been and will be no evasion. This is not the time for evasions.

On the Republican side the issues are obscured behind a smoke cloud not only of misrepresentation and evasion, but of plain mendacity. Principle seems to have been sunk—abandoned—cast away in a mad ambition to secure office and power, regardless of the means or methods. This is being demonstrated on every hand and needs no elaboration on my part. I have neither the time nor the inclination to enter into a discussion of the various Republican attitudes toward, for instance, the commanding issue of the League of Nations. I use the plural form advisedly inasmuch as the attitudes are numerous and interpretations of both the Republican platform and the pronouncements of the Republican candidate for president, multitudinous. "Normalcy" and confusion appear to be synonymous terms in the Republican lexicon.

When Senator Johnson sees white and Senator Lodge sees black while looking at the same object, I have the thought that they are politically color blind, to put it mildly.

The League of Nations is an issue in this campaign; reconstruction is an issue; the high cost of living, tax revision, labor, education, the merchant marine, highway improvement, reclamation, Mexico, corruption in politics, the stimulation of agriculture, the federal reserve act, a budget system for

the federal government,—all of these things are issues, living, pulsing, insistent issues.

But there is one issue—the paramount, the master issue, which embraces them all. That is Progressivism. Are we going to stand still? Are we going to go backward? Are we unequal to the task of keeping pace with the world that refuses to stop moving? From my point of view it is unthinkable that we, the greatest of the nations of the world, the richest, the most forward-looking, the nation which has led and achieved as no nation in history has either led or achieved—that this nation of vision and accomplishment should back-track on any issue.

The struggle to reach the light is a long struggle. The forces of reaction are everlastingly at work to prevent the progress that opening, expanding human mentality constantly seeks and craves and fights and dies for. Great energies are expended in clinging with a desperation deserving of better things to that which is moth-eaten and mildewed and "hallowed" by time and custom and tradition.

There are Tories in this day and age as there were Tories in the time of Washington. There are calamity howlers who fear every forward step. There are men of great wealth and wide influence in this country who have as much vision as an earthworm—who look down, not up; who sigh regretfully and plead plaintively for the "good old times."

The good old times, so-called, are dead old times. The world is so full of new thought, new invention, new vision, new attitudes toward human relationships and the means to higher accomplishment, that the pleas of those reactionaries who attempt to becloud issues that are modern and ideas that are up-to-date seem not only absurd but grotesque.

A wit once remarked in the days following the Civil War that "The Democratic party always stands on the shirt-tail of Progress and hollers 'Whoa.'" I think that illustration can be aptly and honestly applied to the Republican party of Lodge and Smoot and Penrose. I hesitate to say that it would apply to the Republican party of Johnson and Borah, whatever that may happen to be just now. I do not, however, hesitate to say that it does not apply to the party of Theodore Roosevelt, the man who led the hosts of progress in the Republican party away from the Penroses and Smoots and the reactionaries in the memorable campaign of 1912.

Does any man believe that Theodore Roosevelt would subscribe to the platform of the Chicago convention with its evasions? Can you visualize Theodore Roosevelt giving his support to the inanities of Warren G. Harding? Do the men who left the Republican party of reaction in 1912 to follow

Roosevelt into a Progressive camp feel that they can still be going forward if they accept the leadership of the men so bitterly denounced by Colonel Roosevelt when he cast his hat into the ring? I don't believe they do.

The campaign is a battle between *Then* and *Now*. It is between what *was* and what *is*. It is between what *has been* and what *will be*.

A New Party with the Courage of Youth

By DUDLEY FIELD MALONE

WE believe that the Farmer-Labor Party offers to the voters the best medium through which to express independent judgments toward the discussion and adoption of an economic program in the state and nation. It is perfectly obvious that the leaders, national and state, of the Democratic and Republican parties have absolutely no conception of the fact that all our vital problems today are based upon economic considerations. There is no efficient leadership or statesmanship in the two old parties. The Democrats are trying to arouse public interest in a League of Nations which has been dead for a year and a half in Europe, and the Republicans are waiting for word from that noted liberal, Elihu Root, to decide upon what international scheme for peaceful exploitation the Republican Party shall adopt after it gets into office.

The Farmer-Labor Party, with the courage of youth, faces and offers a specific program to meet the vital problems which should engage the attention of the nation in domestic and foreign policy. We advocate as a vital way to strike at the high cost of living the elimination of the middleman, the warehouseman, and profiteer, who have been robbing both producer and consumer alike. And we stand for the encouragement of farmers' and consumers' cooperatives along with credit unions to take from the exploiters the power to rob the public. To meet the housing crisis which is serious in our large cities of the East, we would go straight to the heart of the problem by declaring housing to be a public utility with the consequent destruction of the rings of contractors and real estate manipulators who are gambling with the health and life of working people. We declare against imperialism not merely abroad but at home, and demand the restoration of the Philippines, of Guam, and Porto Rico to the sovereignty of their own peoples. We declare flatly against the Esch-Cummins law and pledge ourselves to legislation which will take from all courts the power to issue injunctions in industrial disputes. We stand not only to champion oppressed peoples abroad, but for the rights of our own oppressed people, the Negroes, and innocent aliens who are being

hounded by the Department of Justice and police agencies in the interest of the present economic system with its advocacy of lynch and mob law. We demand the prompt restoration of all our civil liberties and the immediate repeal of the Espionage Law and all syndicalist laws in the various states. We declare for the nationalization of mines, and the increasing control and management of all our basic industries by the workers. We advocate the principles of the Plum plan for our railway systems, national and local. We declare ourselves definitely in favor of a bonus for the veterans of the late war which shall equal their civilian earnings. And in foreign policy we would merely return to the tradition of the fathers of this country and its greatest leaders, that it is the duty of America to stand at all times with all oppressed peoples and on the side of free institutions. Therefore we demand the immediate recognition of the chosen government of the Russian people and the elected government of the Republic of Ireland. We believe that the two old parties have completely lost their power to register the liberal mind of the masses of our people. We feel confident that the Farmer-Labor Party, representing the demand for a third party and standing fearlessly for an honest program, will be a militant army of comprehending citizens, standing bravely between the forces of reaction and the forces of revolution.

Why I Will Support Debs In 1920

By JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN

TO a believer in spiritual values there is a primary test which must be applied to any political issue irrespective of expediency. What is its relation to the principle of love, of reverence for human personality, and to the two great violators of this principle, war and poverty?

If the problem of poverty did not exist, I should yet be compelled to support the Socialist Party in 1920 as the only political group that has unequivocally declared its opposition to both international war and domestic violence. It was one of the few Socialist parties in the world to maintain its opposition after the declaration of war, and its chief candidate is now bearing witness to his steadfastness in prison. Any pacifist who votes otherwise than for Eugene V. Debs is, for reasons which he must justify to himself, consenting to the indefinite perpetuation of hate and bloodshed.

If war had already been conquered, however, I must yet vote for the Socialist Party in 1920 because it alone stands uncompromisingly for abolition of the poverty which means degradation, suffering, and vice, slavery of millions to the few, and the extinction of democracy and brotherhood. The Socialist Party not alone aims at this freedom from wage-slavery, but works intelligently for its accom-

plishment by means of the ownership and democratic management by all the people of the principal means of production and distribution. The scientific researches of fifty years have served only to strengthen the foundations of Socialist belief, and the political experience of the same period has made Socialism the one firm bulwark against greed and tyranny throughout the world.

Support of Socialism, however, is something more this year than the mere registering of an ideal. We may now turn to the old parties and ask of each the excuse for its existence in this period of decision. Their candidates are colorless respectables, evenly balanced in the upholding of things as they are. Our candidate is a personality. Where Cox and Harding were unknown until last July, the name of Eugene Victor Debs is a word to conjure with, from Ireland to Siberia, from the Western lumberjack to the Lawrence mill-hand; a name significant always not of success as the world counts it, but of leadership, sacrificial courage, and a flaming love for all men. Debs is a candidate to be feared; therefore they have put him in jail.

It is many years since there has been a campaign so void of issues between the great parties. The League of Nations has become a piece of camouflage worth neither attack nor defense; and the campaign fund has taken its place as subject for debate. Republicans and Democrats are openly fusing against the Socialists, not only in local but in congressional elections, throwing away all pretense of any other issue than that between Socialism and capitalism.

The new Labor Party, with the old S. L. P. and the Communists, is the only political group that shares with the Socialists the vision of the new world. Our tactics differ, and there are men and women of good will who, though acknowledging the supremacy of the Socialist ideal, will decide for expediency's sake to support the Labor Party instead. They point to two considerations—the feasibility of moderate rather than of revolutionary demands, and the success of the British Labor Party.

Experiment alone will bring the truth, but Socialists have already watched such experimentation. They have noticed, in the first place, that it is often the revolutionary demands that have proved the driving forces of history. The Crusades, the French and Russian revolutions, grasped at the stars. Even in common-sense America it is not compulsory insurance, the budget system, and the minimum wages that have broken through entrenched politics, but the demands of the extremists—abolition, woman suffrage, prohibition.

Socialists have followed with admiration the successes of the British Labor Party. They realize its righteousness and its strength in the development of British democracy, along with Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, and the Cobden Club.

Great Britain, with its racial unity and its early industrial maturity, has built up the firmest labor movement in the world. Marxian Socialism, however, has never become thoroughly established in England, the group bearing the Socialist label being comparatively weak, divided, and doctrinaire.

In the United States, development has taken almost the opposite direction. Our labor movement, owing to the longer survival of free land, the pre-occupation with slavery, and the successive waves of immigration, has never attained unity, and still remains for the most part divided between the "rewarding friends" policy of Gompers and the anti-political theories of the Syndicalists. Marxian Socialism, however, has had the advantages of working-class literacy, revolutionary immigration from Europe, and a political tradition founded upon the revolutions of the eighteenth century. Our Socialist Party, as a portion of the working-class movement, is small in proportion to the population; but unlike the group of the same name in England, it contains the majority of our political Socialists, and during a continuous existence of twenty years has gained and maintained a formidable third-party position without sacrificing its revolutionary quality.

In Great Britain a strong Labor Party is taking up the work left undone by a weak political Socialism. We American Socialists, with our reactionary and divided labor movement and our comparatively strong Socialist Party, do not consider as efficient the movement to create a new labor party with which we may blend. We have seen Populists and Progressives rise and fall. We have been urged to throw aside our No-Compromise rule in order to fight the trusts with Roosevelt in 1908 and maintain neutrality with Wilson in 1916. The disillusioned leaders of those movements are again urging us to another adventure in expediency.

Meanwhile the world Socialism that in 1916 seemed crushed is now holding the Powers breathless. Capitalism in America is playing its last weapons of despair against us—fusion, expulsion of our legislators, imprisonment of our candidate. Our opponents have come out frankly as the opponents of American tradition and the Constitution of the United States.

If the war had really made the world safe for democracy, if non-socialist labor had really reaped the reward of its nationalism, if civil liberties had really been restored after the armistice, I would still vote for Eugene V. Debs with faith in the ultimate outcome. As it is, I will cast my ballot for the Socialist Party with pity for those men and women who are throwing their votes away.

THE Germans allege that the Allied Army of Occupation costs them 60 per cent. more than their own army before the war. Is it thus the League of Nations promotes peace?

What is Wrong in Profits?

By CHARLES F. DOLE

INASMUCH as the first part of this article was printed last October, it may be well to state briefly the position from which I now proceed.

From the earliest times men have been experimenting with their social institutions, with the family, with government, with religion, with their industrial systems. Beginning ignorant and selfish, they have had to blunder in learning their way toward a just civilization. A great revolt is now going forward, touching every kind of institution. Many are sick of governments, which have done so much harm and so little good. Many are tired of churches, which have signally failed to help the world. Men are weary of war. A multitude wish to discard a system of industry out of which has arisen so shameful a contrast between wealth and poverty. I am in hearty sympathy with the new insistence upon humane conditions of life. But I urge: Let us make our changes and reforms with intelligent foresight. Let us be sure what it is that ails us and make just distinctions.

Let us not be afraid of words. If it is not wrong to take the profits that result from our own labor and skill, it cannot be wrong to possess and use capital. For capital is nothing in itself more than the possession of goods, which can be used to add to themselves further goods. An extra bushel of potatoes used as seed is so much capital, as the tools are which help to plant it. As soon as you accumulate profits of any sort, instead of consuming them at once, you have at least potential capital. Wherein now is the capitalistic system in its naked simplicity, as it begins, oppressive or wicked? It surely offers a means of increased welfare or income to everyone who would have a share in adding his increment to the volume of the product of the world.

Take away artificial restrictions, give no one any special privilege or monopoly, set no barriers between peoples, let whoever will acquire ready access to the land, let every family have as much as a house, lot, and garden-spot as its birthright, let no dead hand be allowed to solidify great blocks of private property in preposterous perpetuity for unborn children—and why may we not then call this same much-abused capitalist system what the spirit in each of us seeks, namely, the *free system*? The wickedness charged against it will now be seen to lie in its abuse, or rather in unconverted, unsocialized, uncivilized human nature. The fact is that men have not yet learned, or been taught to understand, either freedom or democracy. Such democracy as we now have in its present stage of ignorance, of antagonisms and passions, of odious

race prejudice, of nationalistic conceit, of ugly class feeling, would almost surely make any scheme of "socialism" yet proposed a new and terrible form of tyranny—possibly a literal "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," more likely a swaying plaything of inconsiderate majorities, rival rings and factions, controlled by arrogant and unscrupulous leaders.

The free system recognizes frankly the natural fact of profits; this fact works down to the common advantage. It gladly acknowledges the natural gifts in the men who prospect for and procure profits, and thus increase the general prosperity. It recognizes the social function of the economies which conserve both power and material, and produce the volumes of capital needful for the great enterprises of modern industry. To conserve is a means later to be generous. Under the free system in a normal society there would be no capitalistic class. All would have some share, more or less, in the growing wealth. Is it not well that there should be responsibility for the use and conservation of capital? The free system naturally fixes personal responsibility upon everyone. Who would prefer, in place of this, a cumbrous or a rigid scheme of regulation and supervision? We now choose our occupation or trade and our place of work. Do we wish it ordered for us through a bureaucracy?

Rent, as a price charged by a private owner for the use of the gifts of nature, such as land, mines, water privileges, we call wrong and propose to put an end to it. No one deserves such rent for any human service rendered. The resources of the earth are our common heritage. The free system, however, encourages the rent, or interest, which naturally offers itself for the use of all products of labor or skill or genius or prudent economy. Suppose you have built a house larger than you need, and I share it with you. It does not impoverish me to make good to you for enjoying the fruit of your labor. If this is wrong all barter or trade is also wrong. On the contrary, all decent trade is a social function and works to the advantage of both parties.

Does someone say that "money has no fruit" and deserves no interest? But money is merely the order for goods or human labor or skill or other help, which does bear fruit and deserves its equivalent. Do you wish me to lend you a hundred dollars to buy a fishing boat for the work of the coming season, and do you not care to give me a share in your newly increased prosperity? This is interest, and you and I, so far as we possess the tools

or the plant of any industry, are both of us capitalists, and thus useful members of industrial society. The same principle applies in any cooperative enterprise great or small.

Is there any valid difference between profits and ordinary interest upon the use of capital? None whatever, unless you like to think of profits as the extra gains above the average returns of all industries. One farmer just makes a living out of his land; his neighbor, studying the soils and working with his intelligence, "makes money," that is, profits, besides his living. One investor puts his savings into a bank and takes the average worth of the use of money, perhaps five per cent. Another investor, studying opportunities and willing to undergo a risk, chooses the new factory and shares in its profits—quite often, wanting due care, pockets the loss of his money. Do you think that a centralized socialist regime would enter into the good new inventions and open them to us for our common enjoyment more promptly than the free system introduces us to them?

Do you still insist that there ought to be no payment for the use of money? I agree that no one should take advantage of a poor man's necessity. But how about the normal use of money to carry on the constructive work of the world? What if, by the help of the savings of a thousand people, the great highway can be done at once, and ten thousand men usefully employed in doing it, when otherwise it might have to wait for years? Even in a socialist commonwealth there would have to be grand works of construction, and savings, if not in money, then in all kinds of supplies, would be necessary. Would you rather have those savings of capital forced upon the people by the State, or offered willingly, as in the present free system, through the promise of a certain small bonus for the extra work or the economies that produce them and honestly deserve them.

There is no doubt that profits and competition take on a new and sinister peril in view of the vast aggregations of capital made possible in modern big business. There is also a new peril in the struggle for advantage between competing nations. No one ought to be blind to this kind of peril. Great as it is, it does not arise from the normal use of the free system, but on the large scale as on the small from stupid, unjust, and obsolete institutions, laws and customs; from the aggressive and meddlesome conduct of imperialistic governments; and fundamentally from the yet uncivilized human nature. Do you think any foreign market worth going to war for? Do you expect to carry on foreign trade any more than domestic trade with your eyes only on profits and not upon the human welfare which alone gives a worthy purpose to human endeavor? Is your national patriotism so mean and narrow-visioned as to over-run your humanity? It is not a new industrial system

that the world needs, but a new heart, a new conscience, a new sight of the meaning of human life.

Turn it whichever way you please, I do not see that our free system, once divorced from the features of restriction, the survivals of aristocracy, of autocracy, and of imperialism which still cling to it, does not meet every great condition of a democratic commonwealth. It offers the largest possible encouragement to everyone to do some useful service for mankind. It goes, as far as any human encouragement can probably go, without servile tyranny and oppressive personal supervision and regulation, to enforce the natural law: "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." Drop the gains from wholesale monopoly, such as the unearned increment of land; cut down our extravagant legal provisions for the perpetuation of private estates; let the taxes which the rent of land, turned over henceforth to society, does not amply provide fall equitably upon the incomes of all of us; stop wars and the abominable cost of paying war debts, rarely if ever incurred for the welfare of the people; dismiss your soldiers and sink your battleships; and you will have a very small and innocuous proportion of people living out of the labor of their fellows, or out of the extra harvests or winnings of their grandfathers. I urge that, till you have done these things, you'll never have given the free system fair trial.

The free system gives ample scope to the individualists, to the pioneers, in fact to the considerable number of men and women who work most fruitfully when they strike out their own path and take their own pace. No one can measure the value of this minority of human characters in preparing for and making the costly gains of mankind. Proper provision for the best human leadership almost demands this feature of the free system. At the same time, this system, being natural, offers the means of the best development for the great multitude of people, who are not now, and probably never will be, quick to catch ideas, or to adapt themselves to new and varying conditions. We are all better off for the incitement of brilliant leadership.

The fact is that many excellent but unambitious people prefer regular, steady, and well directed work in company with others, while not so many, more individualistic and venturesome, desire to try their own experiments. The free system pursues a higher end than the mere output of product or the distribution of income. It seeks to include and maintain the widest variety of opportunity for all the kinds of people who make a world.

The free system also provides probably the only approximately fair method for the distribution of the good things of life. Do you seek merely justice? Do you demand that each worker of every kind shall have the exact portion of the product of the nation, equivalent to his worth in society?

But bare justice is never possible among men. No one knows how much he or another is worth. No law can determine or apportion such a distribution. The fact is, justice is not possible, and does not exist, apart from humanity. The soul of justice consists in the friendly intent and the humane purpose of each man's life. By this rule we do not think only of money or things; we wish neither to enjoy what we have not merited nor to compel others to pay us our own assessment of our worth. We wish rather as kindly men to do our best for all and give amply *more* than we cost. The free system requires more than laws can ask or compel; for it puts us all upon our honor and our generosity to give more than we get. The constant and irresistible pressure of this ideal law constitutes a continual education in developing the humane character of society. The multiplication of coercive laws and regulations defeats this high end.

Does not the free system, however, invite and forebode the envy, jealousy, hate, and antagonism of class war? Not at all, so far as it is free; but only as it is subject to restrictions and abuse. There are properly under it no separate classes; all workers are cooperators for the common good; all share in the ultimate product; all may be capitalists and shareholders and take profits on new enterprises, or enjoy the average fruits of their savings by the old and safe methods. Let all have freedom of movement to change from unprofitable

work, or to undertake independent careers as farmers, gardeners, or artisans. Let none be tied to machines. If wage workers have been exploited, is it not because the wages of American mines and factories proved for a time to offer a considerable advantage to oppressed peoples in Austria or Italy? This anomalous movement of millions of people, artificially promoted by the tariff system, did not work altogether for our good. It enriched the few, but as a people we have probably suffered more than we have gained from bearing this vast burden of European poverty. It has hampered freedom and brought an extra virus of class feeling with it. We might as well discard the idea of democratic government because of the futility of Congress as to throw away the free system of industry because half-civilized men have played the part of autocrats under it.

In short, the free system at every point draws the cords of willing, cheerful, social cooperation. Cooperation is a greater word than socialism and contains all the value promised under socialism. Cooperation is the characteristic method of democracy. Instead of endless petty regulation and interference, and the offensive menace of oppressive majorities, it offers ever enlarging sympathy and fellowship. It is the everlasting need of the individual, while it is the binding force of all good society. All the spiritual faculties of man culminate in cooperation.

A Socialist Answers

I OWE Dr. Dole and our readers an apology for the long delay between the two parts of his article. The first thing that disarranged our schedule was the printers' strike, and after that Dr. Dole, whom I wished to consult on some points, went abroad. Fortunately the article above, with his introductory statement, fairly covers the ground.

Dr. Dole's essay is not only important in itself, but particularly valuable for *THE WORLD TOMORROW* because it states clearly a position which has not been properly set forth in our pages. *THE WORLD TOMORROW* exists for the discussion of social viewpoints rather than for dogmatic insistence upon one of them. Therefore I welcome this modern statement of what we may perhaps call the philosophy of Henry George as against that of Karl Marx. If I attempt to reply it is entirely in an individual capacity without meaning to commit my fellow editors or to fall back upon the rather spurious majesty of the editorial *we*.

I should like to begin by recording my general agreement with Dr. Dole's desire for freedom and his trust in cooperation. I am also aware that under any form of socialism the problem of freedom will not be automatically solved. But my

position in contrast to Dr. Dole's is this: He believes that by the abolition of rent of land and natural resources, and of privilege in general, the present system can be made free, equitable, and efficient. I believe that it is more easily possible to secure freedom, justice, and efficiency under a collectivism in which not merely land and natural resources but also the principal tools of production belong to and are controlled by society. Both of us agree that rent derived from land, the private ownership of mines, water privilege, etc., is indefensible from the standpoint of social ethics or rational economics. I should go farther and say that since capital in the large sense is socially created it as well as natural resources should be socially controlled. It is interesting to speculate as to what might have happened had private capital grown up divorced from one form or another of privilege; but at this state of development the difficulties of depriving the steel trust, let us say, of the advantages that accrue to it because of its ownership of land and mines, while leaving its stockholders in control of the factories and in possession of profits, seem to me greater than the difficulties of socializing the industry altogether.

I cannot help thinking that Dr. Dole by his illustrations unduly simplified the whole modern system of capitalism. There is a very considerable difference between my lending \$100 to my friend to buy a fishing boat and my investing, for example, \$100 in steel stock. In both cases, however, there is the prior question of how I got the \$100. Under the modern wage system my income from my labor is determined with little reference either to my needs or my value to society. I may get considerably more or considerably less than I myself produce. Indeed, under our system of machine production it is very hard to tell what any given individual or any given industry does produce—so interdependent are we on one another. In the case, for instance, of cotton goods, how shall one determine fairly the division of the sale price between cotton growers, workers in mills and dye houses, and all the agents of distribution? But granting that I have clear right to my \$100; if I invest it in the steel corporation I have no personal relations of friendship or otherwise with either those who manage or those who work in that industry. I take no real part in management; I do not know that my \$100 is put into actual real capital—that is, tools of production. I do know that steel stock has been grossly watered, that its capitalization was largely based on prospective earning capacity. Yet I expect to get interest on that \$100 in perpetuity long after the particular tool for which my \$100 may have been spent has gone the way of all the earth. Dr. Dole would hardly expect his friend, the fisherman, to pay a fluctuating interest anywhere from five per cent. to the blue sky, according to the degree of his prosperity, year after year, long after the original boat was replaced by a larger. This is the true analogy to investments in stock. I have not space to develop the usual socialist argument on capital; but it seems to me that even if one cannot wholly accept the orthodox Marxian theory of value, it is pretty hard to answer the socialist charge that modern capitalism (that is, private control of capital) is in its essence simply "the possession of the power to exploit the labor of the community."

Dr. Dole may object to my statement that the investor expects interest or profit in perpetuity on his original investment, and call my attention to the fact that he is opposed to handing down wealth by private inheritance from generation to generation. I am not sure under the capitalist system what he would do with inheritance. Would he tax it out of existence? In that case, would not the State itself become proprietor of stocks and bonds on so large a scale as to make it the dominant force in industry? In other words, would you not have a state capitalism which would end individualism more surely than any form of socialism has yet proposed to do?

But I suppose the root of my difference with Dr.

Dole is in my belief that profit as the compelling motive in industry has utterly failed to produce a worthy civilization. It is a dominant motive which very manifestly leads to waste rather than to production for use and to tyranny rather than to freedom. Engineers, for example, long ago worked out a system for converting coal into power near the mine mouths and hitching it up with hydro-electric power to light and heat our homes and drive our machinery. The by-products would provide gas, dyes, fertilizer, and what-not. The savings would be enormous. One thing and only one thing stands in the way, and that is the profits not merely of the owners of the coal fields, but of the innumerable middle-men who stand between producer and consumer. This is only one illustration of the breakdown of the profit system simply in terms of efficient production. It leads also to an enormous tyranny of financiers—those who control capital and manipulate credits. The best up-to-date analysis of the economic consequences of the profit motive that I have seen is to be found in Major C. H. Douglas' new book, "Economic Democracy."⁶ He establishes the thesis that while profit "is of small and diminishing importance as compared with the delusive accounting system which accompanies it, and which acts to reduce consistently the purchasing power of effort, it is, nevertheless, of prime importance as furnishing the immediate 'inducement to produce,' which is a false inducement in that it claims as 'wealth' what may just as probably be waste. . . . Further, if the interaction between production for profit and the creation of credit by the finance and banking houses is understood, it will be seen that the root of the evil accruing from the system is in the constant filching of purchasing power from the individual in favor of the financier, rather than in the mere profit itself."

This charge is surely serious enough, but I am concerned even more with the corroding spiritual effects of the dominant profit motive. However you may justify profit, the fact remains that its fruits are evil. Those fruits are wage slavery, want, war, deadly artistic mediocrity. In terms of art, of the creation and appreciation of beauty and truth, no master class has ever been so barren as the modern plutocracy. The ancient aristocracy had at its best a sense of *noblesse oblige*. With privilege went responsibility to a degree all but lacking in a plutocracy whose motive is desire for profit and whose favorite tool is the impersonal and "soulless" corporation. And the profit motive is poisoning the spirit of the workers as well as of the owners. No worthy civilization can be built without honest work. But one of the things that makes the outlook for the future dark is that labor itself has under the profit motive been taught shoddy

⁶Harcourt, Brace & Howe, N. Y.

work. Deprived of the joy of creation and compelled to fight bitterly for a living wage, it has lost many of the high standards of artisanship which flourished under the ancient guilds—the guilds, be it remembered, did not produce for profit, but for use, and at their best they took pride in workmanship for its own sake. Only by a revival of this spirit and the principle of democratic control by the workers can the Cooperative Commonwealth bless the earth.

Dr. Dole, I am sure, will agree that this discussion is in no sense academic. We are living under a social order which is obviously denying to us bread, comfort, security, freedom, enlightenment, fellowship. No such order can endure. Something must take its place, or we shall sink into a period of chaos. Once one might discuss questions of social reconstruction with a certain aloofness. The house in which man had lived might be inadequate to its needs; too many people might be crowded into the garrets and subcellars; the parasites might have the better rooms; but after all the house stood and gave us shelter. But now the foundations are shaken. Already the storms are beating upon the structure of our materialistic civilization, and it will not stand. The problem for all men of good will is while there is yet time to find a way to build a house on secure foundations wherein men may dwell as brothers. How that new civilization shall be built is the one absorbing question of our time. It is not a job that can be done over night; it will require intelligence as well as good intentions. For myself I can only avow my belief that if men of good will and trained minds will face the facts they can build a collective society which will utilize to the full the benefits of machinery and at the same time increasingly emancipate the individual from the tyranny under which he now suffers. With Ramsay MacDonald I believe that the socialist state (or, better, the socialist society) "must be the condition of individual liberty and not merely an authority imposing obedience." No form of socialism, I repeat, will automatically achieve this result. State socialism tends to beaurocracy; syndicalism ignores the fact that man is something more than a producer; the splendid experiment in Russia has yet to overcome its dangerous faith in war and temporary dictatorship as the road to freedom; guild socialism, in some ways the most promising of all modern theories, is not yet grappling adequately with international problems. Nevertheless, it seems to me certain that socialism has a better grip on economic realities in an age of machinery and appeals to worthier human motives than capitalism even in the unlikely event of the reform of that system by the abolition of economic rent. Under socialism intelligence and good will would have a better chance to operate than in any "acquisitive society."

NORMAN THOMAS.

Peaceful Revolution?

THE most interesting news of the month comes from Italy. Comment on that news partakes somewhat of the nature of prophesy, and what is worse, prophesy that is based on rather insufficient data. The outstanding facts seem to be that the employers in the metal trades started to close their factories, and that this action precipitated a crisis in which the workers, who had long been preparing for such an event, took physical possession of buildings and under iron discipline not only held their possession, but preserved order and to some extent carried on production. The movement has spread generally throughout Northern Italy in many lines of industry, and has been attended by little or no violence—a fact which may cause Anglo-Saxons to revise their conventional judgment of the Latin peoples. Even the employers seem somewhat reluctant to go to extremes. Doubtless some of them wish they could emulate Judge Gary, but they have the sense not to attempt the impossible. Meanwhile, the Confederation of Labor has, temporarily at least, decided against the immediate expropriation of the factories, although this remains the ultimate goal of practically all sections of Italian labor. The attitude of the government is the most interesting of all. Premier Giolitti is no Socialist, but he seems to be an intelligent man who wants to guide forces that he cannot wholly control. He has absolutely refused to use the army (it is not an unkind deduction that the army might prove to be a dangerous weapon to use), and he is talking about the appointment of a commission and the framing of laws giving the workers large control over industry, and in particular an opportunity to learn its technical side. The latest reports indicate that he has won a settlement on that basis. Reasons for the moderation of labor are speculative. Meager American dispatches say that the Italian workers have seen the danger of going as fast as Russia did. But it is reasonable to suppose that other causes also were operative. For some time past the Socialist party in Italy has been concentrating its energies on winning the support of the peasants, who have been doing a little expropriating of land on their own account. The land system in Italy is atrocious, and the peasant is aroused against the landlord. It does not follow, however, that the Italian peasant any more than the Russian is prepared to support communism without further education. Moreover, Italy is dependent upon food and raw material from England and America and would suffer even more than Russia from a rigorous blockade. Finally, it is possible that Italian labor, profiting by Russian experience, sees the importance of securing for itself the technical knowledge necessary for the management of industry so that the transfer can be made without confusion.

Vignettes from Germany

Understanding One Another

By EVELYN SHARP

IT is not like any other club you ever knew; but then, neither would you say that the students who use it are particularly like English undergraduates—unless, of course, you have reached the pleasant stage of acquaintanceship at which you learn that Youth, like most things that are eternal, knows no nationality. Intimacy, however, cannot destroy the individuality of our club. It begins the day as a dining-hall, where hungry, lean-faced students come in crowds for the midday meal which is known in Berlin as the "*Quaker-Speisung*," because it is provided by the English Quakers there. It ends the day as a club, all flowers and blue table cloths and reading lamps—"sehr nett," we consider it—where they drift in, two or three at a time, for the sake of the newspapers or the writing materials or the conversation. And the greatest of these is the conversation.

I sometimes wonder whether conversation is exactly the right word for it. Part of the time is spent nightly in trying to decide whether somebody's English is better or worse than somebody else's German. This polite point having been left undetermined, we then get to work and, in a mixture of tongues, discuss a mixture of topics, ranging from the cost of living to the ethics of revelation. Sometimes, when I am conducted home to my doorstep by a handful of young men and women, conversing genially all the way on the ethics of revelation, I find myself beginning to understand the naïveté of the German theologian who was heard to observe, the other day, that he wished Great Britain would keep to her task of organizing the world and leave Germany to settle religion.

In our students' club, fortunately, the search after theological interpretation is varied with attempts to learn English, and controversy may rage as hotly over the correct translation of a word as over the origins of the universe. That is scarcely surprising in a Quaker settlement with so international a personnel as ours; and the inquiring Berliner, after learning from one Friend that the English call a drawing-pin a drawing-pin, is naturally perplexed when another Friend from the other side of the Atlantic tells him it is a thumb-tack or a push-pin. Even the deeper subjects acquire a lighter character when one of these young Gerhards or Helmuths or Wolfgangs (who would have shone as a member of a Military Tribunal during the war) arrives armed with a dictionary and, after studying it for some minutes in silence, suddenly fires this kind of question at one, in carefully prepared English—"Do the Quakers become more

often murdered (*sic*) than other people because the murderer knows they will not themselves seek to defend?"

In comparison with solving these moral problems, helping someone to compose a letter in English becomes a simple matter, however limited (though splendid) the vocabulary of the writer may be. "Unfortunately, last winter have I attained a grippa," he writes; and it is hard to have to tell him that he merely had a common attack of influenza. Still, it is very satisfactory to stop him from subscribing himself "Yours respectfully," which, expressive as it may seem (to the jingo) of the attitude of mind proper to a defeated people, does not in the least describe the writer's frank and friendly relations with the Friends who run a club for him.

Through these students, both men and women, who come in looking so neat and clean, one learns how it is that to the superficial observer there appears to be no distress in Germany. Very few of them are living at home; yet, whether they lodge in rooms or in boarding-houses, it seems to be an understood thing that their clothes are mended for them. At least, that is how I construe their grateful refusal of my offers to darn their socks; though it is true that they may be deterred by the Cubist effect of a purple patch on a pale blue sock, which represents my average attempt to grapple with the limited range of darning wools in the Berlin shops. The *Hausfrau* of their acquaintance would scorn to be beaten by such a trifle. When you have turned all your house-linen into clothes for the children, and your curtains into summer frocks, matching a stocking with unravell'd wool from some old scrap of carpet or rag of materials is a very slight exercise in ingenuity. It is only on a level, in fact, with the paper string that ties your parcels, or the paper fabric that upholsters your seat in the railway carriage.

Our club membership might be described in German slang as a "*Leipsiger Allerlei*." We have the Prussian of the old school, still boyishly "*Kaiser-treu*," still rich enough to belong to a dueling corps and to smoke and drink beer. Unless he is an ex-officer, he is generally very young; and when he comes in, fresh from his first duel, with bandaged skull and scratched face, older men smile indulgently and observe that if he had been in the field for five years he would not want to play at sham fighting now. He is very much in the minority, and in contrast to him we have the young Internationalist of the new school, the boy or girl who also lived through the famine years of the war at home, but who has come out of it with a hatred for war, not necessarily because it destroys life, but because it destroys universal brotherhood.

"In England," said one of these younger students, "perhaps you are pacifists because you want to be Christians. Not many of our pacifists are like that. We believe in stopping international war; but if it is necessary to have an armed revolution in order to destroy the capitalism which causes war, we should not think it wrong to use force."

Then we have the "Wandervogel," with his guitar and his loose white Schiller collar, and his aloofness from politics and parties, which he is out to destroy as part of the old conventional German system that he despises; and side by side with him is the son of the small official, turned out both superficially and mentally on the old conventional pattern. The great majority of all these are poor, so poor that it hurts them to see a match wasted, even if it is somebody else's match; so poor that the "*Quaker Speisung*" is often the only meal they get in the day; so poor that large numbers of them have to earn their living in some way or another in order to be able to stay at the University at all—a thing that was prohibited in Germany before the war.

There is, for instance, the tall, thin youth with eager eyes, whom any mother would want to carry off for a month's fun and food; he worked in the mines for a year in order to raise the money necessary for a college career. There is the professional man's son, who tells us how he and others scavenged the Berlin streets, last winter, in order to maintain themselves while at the University. There are many more who give lessons or toil in offices all day, sacrificing college lectures and studying for their examination only from books in the evening, because they would be too poor otherwise to meet the immensely increased cost of living. And the greater number of those who come to the cheap dinner in the middle of the day owe to it their one chance of being able to remain in Berlin till they have taken their degree.

Then there is the silent, melancholy man, with maimed face and foot; he is scarcely ever at the club, because he has to clean house for his mother, who keeps them both by going out to work as a seamstress. There is the cheerful fellow with a perpetual smile, who threads my needles with his one hand quicker than I can thread them with two. His mission at the club seems to be to keep us from growing too serious; but he turns suddenly serious himself, one evening, and declares that the undernourishment of Germany is producing in her people a great spiritual awakening which is going to save the world. There is the ex-soldier who had a great admiration for England until it was sorely tested by his prison experiences there, and—blessedly!—also the ex-soldier who hated England until his treatment in prison showed him her best side. And there is the ex-officer who commanded a prison camp after he was disabled and still corresponds with his former French captives—"because I think

it is only by understanding one another that we shall ever avoid war."

I have to remind myself constantly that a Quaker club would naturally attract the pacifist rather than the fire-eating sort of student; for we have so many pacifist members that I should otherwise wonder how Germany ever managed to carry on a war at all. And when one reflects that, on general principles, the country that makes the next war is usually the country that was defeated last time, perhaps a club in which we merely try to understand one another—with a dictionary—for two hours every evening has its uses as well as its humors.

Two Enemies and a Friend

By EVELYN SHARP

I

IT was a students' Saturday excursion. We had traveled out from Berlin in a train so crowded that enterprising passengers might even be seen clinging to the wooden platform that runs along the outside of the carriages. We had walked through a trim little suburb to a trim little pine wood with a neat round hill in the middle of it. We had climbed to the top of the *Aussichtsturm* that a thoughtful Fatherland provides for the tourist, and we had exclaimed in two languages at the beauty of the view. We had sung Wandervogel folk songs as we tramped down the hill again; and now we sat talking in a café on the borders of a smiling lake, and counted the grains of sugar in our black coffee ("*Bohnen-Kaffee*," too; none of your "*Ersatz*!") and ate the thin slices of sour brown bread we had brought with us.

He was a Prussian ex-officer, very upright and well turned out, very cocksure in his manner—the sort of Berliner that confirms the comfortable theory of victorious Powers that militarism still flourishes in Germany and that there is no distress among the people. The Quaker woman to whom he was talking of Art and Music thought she had never seen a face in which good and evil were so sharply defined. His eyes were kind and human, sometimes anxious, sometimes amused; his mouth was hard and cruel, and when he smiled he reminded her of a dog showing its teeth. She thought of all the people in England, readers of popular newspapers, who would have said, "I told you so!" if they had met her companion. It is probable that they would not have seen the look in his eyes.

Suddenly she became aware that she was seeing only his mouth, parting every now and then with its hateful little smile. He had stopped talking about Strauss's new opera, stopped explaining that the proletariat was incapable of governing people like himself because it could not appreciate Strauss's new opera. How the conversation had switched to the Peace Treaty she did not know.

She knew it was none of her doing, though it was too late to think of that now. She was only aware, emphatically aware, of the bitter sentences that came painfully through the set teeth and twitching lips of the boy who sat beside her. He was no more than a boy, as the English count years.

"Go back and tell your country," he was saying, "that what they have done to us will never be forgotten in Germany. That you have defeated us we can bear, because we are soldiers. But we can never forgive you for breaking faith with us over Wilson's Fourteen Points, for using your victory to humiliate us, for starving our women and children after we laid down our arms. We can never forget that, never! I tell you," he rushed on, sweeping aside her interruption; "when the time comes, much as we have learned to hate war in the last five years—you English don't believe that, but it is true!—there is not a child in Germany today who will not volunteer to fight, to punish you and France for breaking us now. When the time comes—I!"

"No!" said his companion gently. "Oh, no!" She was desperately holding on to her faith, holding on to the look in the boy's unhappy eyes, eyes that had looked on so much horror and anguish and yet had not grown hard and old like his mouth. "You do not know Germany. You do not know yourself. Germany will not do what you say. She will be too big for that—when the time comes."

"*Doch!*" he broke in scornfully. "You will see! You—"

A shout of laughter from the others who sat chattering round them drowned the end of his sentence. When it subsided, she was in the middle of hers, and he had to listen.

"... because the next war is always the revenge of the country that was defeated last time. That is why war never stops. You who made peace with France in 1871 ought surely to know that. Oh, do let me go on—"

"But that was different!" he burst out impatiently.

"It is always different, and always the same!" she laughed back. "Don't you really see what a magnificent opportunity Germany will have when the time comes? Why, the whole future of civilization may depend on the way she takes her revenge then! The sequence of war will never be broken till a country that has grown strong enough to take her revenge does the big thing and refuses to fight. No country has ever been great enough for that yet—"

"Nor ever will be!" he flung at her with a sneer.

"Yes," she said slowly. "I think Germany may be great enough if the militarists—here and everywhere else—will leave her girls and boys alone. Oh! Surely you don't think less of your country than I do?"

A reluctant smile crept over his white, passion-

ate face. He threw out his hands with a sudden gesture of utter weariness.

"*Ach!* You pacifists!" he said.

II

He had the head of a young Goethe, whose name, like so many German students, he bore. There was no one else in the Students' Club that evening, and the Friend in charge of it had time to talk. But he, usually so silent, was for once doing most of the talking; and he did it very slowly and seriously, in an English learned entirely from books.

His father was an International Socialist; the war had nearly broken his heart because he had believed that the workers would never take part in another war. Young Wolfgang himself had not fought in the field—"But not because I was too young, for many of my friends volunteered while they were still fifteen; many were killed before they were seventeen. I would not volunteer. I think like my father about these things."

At his *Oberrealschule*, he told her, he had stood out alone against the military training that pretended to be physical drill; he was persecuted both by teachers and school-fellows till his parents removed him to a school in a less militarist quarter of the town. And now, a philological student at the University, he sat and told her, in his simple, terribly effective English, something of what war had meant to the nation at home, during the hunger years of 1916-17, when the whole people lived through the worst winter within memory on turnips cooked in water.

"I myself saw a woman die in the street. She had stood in a *Reihe*—how do you say? a queue?—outside a butcher's shop, from three in the morning. It was the coldest night I have ever known. She stood there; they all stood there; hour after hour; no one spoke. The snow was on the ground. They waited because someone said there would be a little meat in the shop in the morning. The shop did not open in the morning. Still they waited. The wind was awful. In the afternoon, the butcher came and told them there was no meat. Some of them were very angry. But that woman, she said nothing; she fell down. I went and looked at her; she was dead."

The room became very silent. The Friend in charge began mechanically to put the books and papers together, preparatory to closing the club. The strange, unboylike voice went on again:

"I myself, too, saw a child crushed. It was because someone said there was bread in a shop. Our bread rations always left us hungry after we had eaten. We did not always get all our rations. So when they thought there was some bread left in a shop, the people outside made a rush to get in. He was a very little child, and weak. We all were weak. So he was knocked down. When the crowd

was cleared away, he was dead, like that woman. He was a very little child." There was another pause. Then he added, almost, as it were, with indifference—"There was not any bread in that shop."

The Friend in charge moved involuntarily into the shadow, away from the lamp. There did not seem to be anything for her to say. Young Wolfgang waited for no encouragement, however. It was as though, after storing up unforgettable visions so long in silence, he had to tell this enemy, who was also by God's grace a Friend, all that was graved on his memory.

"You do not see many 'Saenglinge'—tiny babies—in Berlin today. The hunger made mothers too weak to have babies. When they have them, the babies are often too small and weak to live. In the war thousands have died. If you go into South Germany, into the country, where the people can keep the food for themselves, you will see more babies, perhaps—I do not know. But not as before the war, anywhere. And here in Berlin, and in other large cities, thousands have died. If you go outside, into the suburbs where the burial grounds are, you will see what a number of little graves there are. Myself, I am glad they have died."

"Oh! Why?" she asked involuntarily.

There was the faintest ghost of a smile in the unnaturally grave young face as he answered her. "Because they will not grow up to make a war of revenge," he said.

Wandering Birds

NEAR Nurnberg in Bavaria there is a little city of some seven thousand inhabitants called Kronach. Built in the twelfth century around the lofty hill fortress of some forgotten Markgraf, it has withstood the attacks of its warlike neighbors and of time. This old-fashioned town has recently been the scene of a remarkable conference of young people from all over Germany. On a sunny May afternoon the slow trains brought in some two thousand Wandervögel who had come together to discuss the future of their movement. The Wandervögel movement began in 1896 as a revolt against the stupid school customs of beer-drinking, smoking, dueling, and in fact the whole régime of the German Mrs. Grundy. Its members made up parties instead to wander through the country with their guitars, learn folk-songs and dances, sleep in barns, cook their meals camp-fashion, and share the life of the country people. Bound together by their common love of nature, by the spirit of revolt against custom, and by wanderlust, the Wandervögel have grown from a small group until they now number many thousands.

During the war their little gray song-book, the "Zupfgeigenhansl," found its way into the trenches and represented a little bit of home preserved

among the horrors of war. Many of the Wandervögel were killed, but even during the war the movement gained strength. Most of the men who came to Kronach had been soldiers. The purpose of the gathering was to form some union of the elder Wandervögel which would preserve their beloved associations after they became too old and too busy to wander around the country playing the guitar.

Railroad fares are high in Germany (except for the foreigner, for whom the rate of exchange makes everything cheap), and trains are slow. For many of the Wandervögel the trip to Kronach made by the slowest trains and in fourth-class carriages represented the fruit of months of saving.

Many of the delegates, including girls of eighteen and twenty, were barefoot, while others clattered along in wooden sandals. This may have been partly due to the spirit of revolt; but it also reflected the fact that a pair of shoes in Germany nowadays costs a small fortune.

The ex-soldiers proceeded to hold a parade and review which burlesqued the whole idea of militarism. The square was lined with girls crowned with garlands. After long suspense the procession came headed by a band of guitars, flutes, and fiddles. They entered the square with the goose-step, now so much detested that many of the Wandervögel prefer to keep no step at all when they are walking together. Then came the prisoners of war, to whom the girls threw flowers amid much laughter. The artillery consisted of stove-pipes mounted in perambulators; the air force of a plane made out of newspapers and rubbish; and the German fleet was represented by a man sitting in a bathtub equipped with a mast and other nautical gear. To show that it was still formidable the navy splashed water plentifully on incautious bystanders. Most of the heroes who took part in this procession were decorated with gold lace, epaulettes, and huge iron crosses applied with chalk. In the square somebody made a grandiloquent speech after the manner of the crown prince and bestowed large wooden decorations on the heroes of the occasion. The band and the choir meantime rendered the German version of "For he's a jolly good fellow."

The little Evangelical church was crowded Sunday morning for a service in memory of the Wandervögel who had fallen in the war. It is doubtful whether the church had ever contained more people or whether it had seen a more remarkable service. The seats were full of girls and young women whose fathers and brothers had been soldiers, and in the aisles, on the floor, and in every available inch of space remaining were men who had fought in the German ranks. Beyond the altar rail hung the great wreathed crosses which still recalled the dead to the memory of the living. What an opportunity for a nationalistic sermon! What a time and place for Periclean words in praise of the fallen, for a defense of Germany's part in the war, for

a glorification of the German national ideal!

But the expected did not happen. The minister read the ninetieth psalm ("Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations"), a psalm which would have harmonized very badly with a nationalistic sermon. Then he referred to the grief of the survivors and the loss to Germany caused

by the death of so many of the German youth; he suggested that these brave spirits were with them yet unseen; he appealed to the Wandervogel to shoulder the heavier task that fell upon them in this time of distress and need. That was all. To the only Britisher present it seemed that this sermon might have been preached by a Quaker.

Probing the Irish Problem

IT is a plain fact that in the restoration of friendly relations between a free Ireland and a free England the United States has almost as much at stake as the countries immediately involved. In the world of economic and commercial rivalries over oil and trade there is enough to endanger the friendship between England and America without the presence of a moral issue which speaks passionately not only to the hearts of Americans of Irish race but to many other lovers of liberty. No joint Anglo-American demonstrations in commemoration of the sailing of the Pilgrims can avail against the ill-will created by the Irish problem. It is therefore a real service which *The Nation* has done in summoning the Committee of One Hundred, including Congressmen, Senators, mayors of cities, Governors, and publicists and citizens of the highest standing, to create an informal commission to try to ascertain the truth of the atrocity stories. The new internationalism means that thoughtful citizens must concern themselves about problems of peace and of freedom without waiting upon governments. The purpose of this commission is to gather the facts of atrocities from both sides and to report them without recommendation as to political relations between Ireland and England. Its findings ought to help to focus moral forces so as to secure the peaceful solution of present problems.

In the meanwhile, Lord Mayor MacSwiney and the other hunger strikers are offering a tremendously heroic proof of the will of the Irish people for freedom. So great and significant for the future is the drama that is now being enacted in English jails and all through the Irish countryside that it seems a special duty to our readers to give them the best information that reaches us. We quote, therefore, without further comment, extracts from two letters from our correspondent, Mrs. Phillips, and finally the most significant paragraphs from an editorial in the London *Nation* of September 4th, 1920. It is this editorial in the London *Nation* which gives us most hope. If it rather than the shameful sack of Balbriggan expresses the true will of Britain, there is hope of a restoration of peace and amity between the free peoples of Ireland and England.

I.

Sensational episodes in the Irish drama arise and have their day. Long before this reaches you and the readers of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* new crises will have shaken the stage and been retired to the wings; but each has had its meaning for the plot and should not be forgotten. . . .

Archbishop Mannix careered up and down the newspaper columns for a time and disappeared. One hot, dusty Sunday afternoon I went to a demonstration protest meeting in Trafalgar Square, where George Lansbury and others spoke to the Hands-off-Ireland refrain. Who, unless they knew the English way, would think to see the flag of the Irish republic waved there between the lions of the monument? But Irish opinion in London is unenlightened. It is a kind of traditional, conscientious jingoism, no more. The Irish here complain because the *Daily Herald* gives them too little space. British labor needs enlightenment, needs facts, George Lansbury says, if only Sinn Fein will send these out in educational form. For there are two groups of defenders of Ireland here: the nationalists and the people who believe in freedom for freedom's sake. Sinn Fein or the Irish Labor Party should not neglect what chance there is for solidarity with English workers. The two groups exist as distinctly in the United States. Some of us feared a little to see De Valera touching the subsoil of New York politics at all. Then events proved the danger imaginary. As a Sinn Fein lawyer, up in the rock country of Donegal, said to me: "De Valera's straight. They can throw all the mud they like at him. We know him. They can't hurt him for us." . . .

The Home Rule Congress next had a turn in the newspapers. To me, the most significant remark in that gathering of business and commercial men was: "If the government doesn't stop this coercion policy, we'll all be damned Republicans." And that is happening fast.

Whether the Lord Mayor of Cork lives or dies his work is done. To speak in coldest blood of the matter, the government's performance is suicidal. Pure legality should not, cannot exist in human affairs. It is easy to fancy the effect in Ireland, whether the tense thread of feeling snaps now or

not. That the days will tell. Everyone knows the sequence of Easter, 1916, when Dublin changed overnight from condemnation of the uprising to vivid enthusiasm for it, till it became a national memory, changed from hissing to angry tears. Together with the no-conscription campaign of 1918 and the hunger strike in Mountjoy prison, it marks one of the highest points in the swiftly mounting popularity of Sinn Fein. Terence MacSwiney has joined Pearse and Conolly.

II

It is unfortunate that where passive and active resistance exist side by side, the latter always receives public notice. Ultimately it receives credit or blame which may be undeserved. There are two aspects of the Sinn Fein movement: the constructive work of the Sinn Fein government, and the fighting campaign against England. The two are separable in the mind. In practice they may or may not be. The Sinn Fein leaders think not.

Of the two, the former is indubitably praiseworthy. The courts and the Volunteers administer justice and keep the peace over large districts of Ireland, though only the force of public opinion supports the decisions, and the Volunteers are indistinguishable young men in slouch caps and ordinary clothes. There is the spirit of a game about it all that keeps men patient, yet the mood, too, of serious purpose. Unionists are as willing as republicans to admit and enjoy this régime of law and order. Protestants testify to the practice of religious toleration. Commissions are investigating Irish industries, are at work upon a land adjustment and similar concerns of a government which shall build an advancing national polity. "This is not anarchy but order," says the *Manchester Guardian*; "the order, it is true, of a rival to the established government, but still order, and order so well accepted by political opponents that an attempt on the part of Dublin Castle to break down this system would be deplored by the Unionists in the South as disturbing their serenity." Yet England insists on uniting Ireland by legalizing the English methods of rule through the Coercion Act. Already, as I write, one Sinn Fein court has been broken up and the mayor of Cork deported.

All the constructive work, Sinn Fein claims, would be impossible without the guerilla warfare upon spies, police, and the army of occupation. For years Dublin has been haunted by "G men," plain-clothes spies, who were at every social gathering and public meeting. If they were still at their job, not a member of Dail Eireann or one of the commissioners would be out of prison to carry on his work. But only four of the G men are living, and they are cowed. No one recognizes the workers of the Sinn Fein government. But these men know what is brewing in the English councils. Frank Brooke, for instance, was a close friend and informant

of Lord French. The action of Sinn Fein in having him shot was self-protective and in their eyes humane.

In the first place, they believe that they are saving the lives of hundreds by removing a man like Colonel Smyth, who was recommending a wanton policy to the police. In the second place, they do not consider such action assassination. It is execution. Any nation destroys a citizen who informs the enemy against them. The police are always given a chance to surrender. The soldiers do yield more often and fewer fatalities occur. Prisoners are disarmed and set free without maltreatment. The Irish people are carrying on no campaign of "frightfulness" to satisfy the extreme element, but a reasoned policy based on the usual tactics of governments.

Anyone who knows the ethics of governments for the despicable thing they are must claim at once that this is an unfortunate premise; but it is not for governments to condemn, nor to pretend smugly that violence is all on one side. The pacifist has that right to censure. The individual may believe that the Republic will be shadowed in the future by the color of her present tactics; that even the proof that one opponent has sinned through centuries makes a feeble case for similar wrong done by the other. He may hold that Colonel Smyth alive, uttering his indefensible orders, was a stronger agent for Sinn Fein with the public than Colonel Smyth dead. To which a Sinn Fein leader answered me that in his experience the public sympathizes with the suffering people rather than with the oppressor. There is something naïve in the belief. For human beings have an antipathy to violence unless it is clad in the regalia of *bona fide* war, and in the papers they only read of murders. They could not grasp the political aspect as it appears to an Irishman. And plenty of Irishmen are puzzled. They ought at least to know more than the newspapers of either side divulge by their partisan gunpowder anecdotes, before accepting or rejecting a policy as citizens of the Republic.

For a fact, the war will go on. England must bungle into reconquest or liberation—the case is fast narrowing to that. "We shall be free or all be dead," as one man said, with a grim but genuine smile. The leaders are not wild-eyed or blood-thirsty, but unobtrusive, purposeful men with long months of devilish humiliation and imprisonment in their memories and the light of an ideal behind their eyes. They claim they have no hate for England, but they do often despise not alone the government, but the people for their hypocrisy. Here again ignorance and incompatible viewpoints play their part. Too few Englishmen know that Sinn Fein also publishes its list of outrages; too few have pictured at all the brutality of raids on Irish homes, where the women suffer most; too few be-

lieve the Irish a capable people. Through the maze of questions, moral, economic, political, religious, I always find, after various trials, that the key to the exit is: Ireland must work it out. Only on this foundation of freedom can be built up the understanding by which the two nations can live together sanely in their interrelated commercial world.

ESTHER PHILLIPS.

III

EDITORIAL FROM THE LONDON "NATION"

The government of Ireland by England has ceased to exist. Its title is gone. Governments live by their possession of all sorts of virtues and half-virtues; by dispensing justice, glory, wealth, or quiet days; by extorting submission or dividing power; by force or by art. Machiavelli thought the despot would succeed by combining these arts; the democrat would make the people judges of the quality of their rulers. But all agree that some tie of morals or expediency should unite governors and governed. When, therefore, all the citizens declare by act or by word the worthlessness of their government; when it resorts only to force, in its crudest form; and when this method only inflames the popular hatred, abdication becomes the only way out. If we left Ireland tomorrow, there would be physical strife between some Orangemen and some Catholics, as there is today. But there would be no murders, arson, pillage by soldiers and policemen. No Irish towns would be sacked. Officials would cease to cower behind the walls of their barracks and offices. Justice would be an open and imperfect piece of social machinery, instead of a secret political plot. If there were assassins, they would be punished and reprobated instead of being lionized. England would be as popular as she would deserve to be, not a name for Irish people to shudder at, while Ireland would be a normal collection of happy and unhappy, good and bad, men and women, in debate with each other, and in a state of moderate happiness, instead of a roaring furnace of passion. There is but one cause of all the evils we have described, and its removal is in our hands as absolutely as is the life of the Lord Mayor of Cork.

We have left the most powerful function of British authority in Ireland to the last. It lies in the promotion and direction of Anglo-Irish war. British soldiers and police are openly surrendered to the wild license of revenge. The burning down of creameries—the most splendid and the most entirely non-political institution in modern Ireland—the firing into hospitals, the sacking of towns, the raiding of dwellings, the resort to murder as a punishment for murder—attest the fact that civil order has ceased to operate through the medium of the British Government. In its stead war between England and Ireland has begun, even though it be

not proclaimed. The casualty lists are duly published; and the conduct of our troops can only be paralleled by that of the Germans in France, or let us say of an ill-disciplined British army advancing against a resisting German army and population.

But there is one work of the British occupation of Ireland which is peculiar to the political ground which we occupy since the destruction of Home Rule by Mr. Lloyd George. By our mere presence in Ireland, and by the influence of the Orange faction on our Government's counsels, we are the backers of the civil war which is the auxiliary to the national war. An Orange army is at work in Ireland as well as a British one, and has achieved a brilliant success. Its strategic aim is the "clearance" of Northeast Ulster. In pursuit of its dragonnade, it has already, says Mr. Hugh Martin, of the *Daily News*, driven five thousand Catholic shipwrights and engineers from the Belfast shipyards. It has "evacuated" the entire Catholic populations of Lisburn and Banbridge, and relieved the Ballymacarrett district of two thousand men, women and children. One or two minor operations—such as the burning of a convent (with the sleeping nuns)—have failed; but under the benevolent inaction of the British Government and its refusal to sanction out-of-work pay to exiled and starving Catholics, the major envelopment has been little short of a triumph. The Orange regiments had the further advantage of fighting under the Union Jack, and thus ensuring the respect of the British soldier for that time-honored emblem of liberty.

We came therefore to the sanguine conclusion that the British government of Ireland is over. After the pogrom of Belfast we can only hope the end will be soon; for we would rather see the Union Jack in different company from its promoters. That any competitive system, Monarchical or Republican, could be worse, is a thing quite beyond the rather lurid imagination of man to conceive. It is so stupid, cruel, unjust, and purposeless; such a blight on us as well as on the land it plagues; such a waste of virtue in two great peoples; and such a shame even to this ill-governed world, that we can only pray for its death before some new sin can be laid to its charge. For the Government is now set on a course of pure destruction. All is to go. The Sinn Féin order must perish with the murderous lawlessness; and the vision of Irish freedom sink with the horrid apparition our misrule has conjured up. If that happens, then, indeed, the loss will have been cast against the British Empire. It will destroy its victim, and perish with it.

THE appropriately named Mr. Grabski, Polish minister of finance, has warned the United States that unless it wants to lose \$169,000,000 already invested in Poland, it will have to give more financial aid and perhaps even military help.

Conferences That Look Forward

THAT conflict between religion and revolution which Mr. C. Delisle Burns discusses on another page is already here and there being resolved in a larger synthesis. To this certain recent conferences bear witness.

The annual conference of the Fellowship of Reconciliation at Highland, New York, gave encouraging evidence of the growing determination of an increasing number of men and women to apply to every-day life, to war, and to industrial strife, the spirit of Jesus, to the end that a really genuine brotherhood may be established between all nations and races of men. An excellent report of proceedings of the conference will be found in the Fellowship News Letter shortly to be issued. Those who are not members of the Fellowship but who are interested in knowing about it and about its conference may receive copies of the news letter by application to Paul Jones, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 118 East 28th Street, New York.

Of larger moment from an international standpoint was the All Friends conference in London during the closing days of August. This meeting brought together Friends from all over the world. Their spirit is to be found in certain messages which they adopted. They congratulated the Council of Action on its "Impulse toward peace." With true Quaker caution and genuine desire to be sure that the means as well as the ends were idealistic the message went on to state: "How far the methods contemplated by your Council are such as we could endorse, we do not presume to judge, but we have observed your efforts towards peace with Russia with grateful sympathy." In like manner the conference declared in favor of "withdrawal of all coercion and violence against Ireland or against any part of Ireland, and the cessation of all kinds of violence by all sections of Irish people" in order to secure a reconciliation between the peoples of Great Britain and Ireland. More definite were the specific suggestions adopted at the conference with regard to the state of Europe. They included resumption of normal relations with Russia, and cessation of war against the Soviets; the re-establishment of the economic life of the nations of Central Europe; the remodeling of the League of Nations and the inclusion therein at the earliest possible moment of Germany, Austria, and Russian, and any other nations, large or small, that wish to come in; "the abolition of compulsory military training, and general disarmament among all the nations as essential for the removal of fear, the re-establishment of peaceful industry, and the reconstruction of the life of the world on the Christian basis of cooperation and goodwill."

Finally, the conference issued a searching letter to Friends and Fellow Seekers of which we quote two paragraphs:

"Progress is not inevitable. It depends upon men and women; upon what kind of men and women we are. No social reconstruction which is merely material can achieve what is needed; indeed, without a corresponding spiritual change it must miserably fail. Through any difficulties, however great, let us be ready to go forward with quiet faith and courage. And even if the outcome of the great unrest which is around us should not be the new world of our hopes, but rather that our present civilization itself should crumble and vanish in darkness and ruin, we must hold fast faithfully to the one way of life which can lead us as individuals and as a race into the world for which we long. This is Christ's way, the method of fellowship and service, which finds in personal contacts the true key to the door of happiness, which sees in every man a being of infinite value, who may become a creative point in the new order, that order which even now is growing up amid the confusion of our stricken world.

"Behind our restlessness God is here. He is still working in the world amid the lives of men. Let us open our minds to His searching truth. Can we not seek the way of Jesus, testing, step by step, all life's relationships by His spirit? It will mean sacrifice if we are honest. It will mean drastic changes in industry, in business, and in domestic life."

But not alone for the Friends was there a stirring of a new consciousness. So conservative a body as the Lambeth Council of Bishops of the Episcopal Church issued a statement which, while far from a revolutionary document, manifests a real concern for a new application of Christianity.

The most outspoken declaration of Christian internationalism, however, and the most thoroughgoing attempt at working out a doctrine of Christian revolution was to be found at the Bilthoven conference "Looking toward a Christian International." We quote part of a letter from Miss Kathleen Whitaker giving an account of the proceedings of the conference:

There was a young German ex-officer who is spending all his time and energy in working against militarism. He has prepared a statement to which he has already obtained over two thousand signatures in Germany, and hopes to get thousands more, both men and women, in all countries. In this statement the signers pledge themselves never again to take up arms against their fellow men, whether of their own or any

other nation; never to assist in the production of war material; never voluntarily to pay money for any war purpose, or to vote for any representative who will support a war. He is anxious to get in touch with people in other countries who will help him in this work, and is particularly eager to have facts about the conscientious objector movement and other anti-war activities for publication in Germany.

There was a German labor leader—a little, delicate woman with an eloquence and power, born of love for her fellows, which is irresistible. She is a candidate for parliament for the Independent Socialists and stands, practically alone among her comrades, absolutely against the use of violence. It was she who told us of the German workers' plan for the rebuilding of France.

There was a Roman Catholic priest from Austria who had founded the World Peace Union of the White Cross, a Roman Catholic society whose goal is international and social reconciliation; in other words, the Christian Revolution. Its purpose is expressed in the Latin words "*Ut caritas Christi rursus dominetur in hominibus.*" He has had little encouragement, naturally, from the Austrian state church, but the Pope has been interested and sympathetic.

There was an English labor leader who spent most of the war years in prison as a conscientious objector and is a parliamentary candidate for the Independent Labor Party, and a town councillor. He fought the last municipal election as a conscientious objector and was elected by a double majority.

There was a young German, formerly a Lutheran minister, now a Quaker, who is working in close touch with the Friends' relief commission in Berlin; and an Austrian professor, an artist, with the heart of a child. Both these men spoke almost with bated breath of the work of the English and American Friends, and it was borne in upon us that what they have been and are doing is one of the biggest, perhaps the biggest, pieces of missionary work in the world's history. In Germany and Austria today, perchance too in other countries, people are asking: "What is it that makes these people do this thing?" and are realizing that this is Christianity in action.

There was an Italian who told us how much is being done in Northern Italy for the starving Austrian children, and how the hatred and resentment on both sides are being broken down by these little messengers of reconciliation.

There was an Irishman who gave us a new vision of Ireland and her ideals and made us see, as some of us never had before, that it is her national soul, rather than mere political freedom that Ireland is fighting for. He told how the Irish temperament is essentially anti-militarist and the Sinn Féin plan

is to gain its ideals by methods of passive resistance, and he said: "If these methods succeed, Ireland will be the best friend England ever had; but if England refuses we shall learn to hate her, and if we learn to hate we shall lose our soul."

There were many other interesting personalities, Scandinavians, Finns, and Dutch; two Hindoos and a young Swiss idealist; Belgians, Germans, French and Austrians; South Africans, Japanese, Americans and British.

Valuable as were the regular sessions of the conference and the discussions of the problems that are facing us, I think the most vital part of it all was the intimacy of our life together during that wonderful week, the utter absence of all dividing lines. One of the German women said one day, "this is the land of the future." We realized how artificial are the barriers of nationality, color, creed and class. They certainly do exist (it is no use blinking that fact), and they are very strong, for they have been laboriously built and carefully preserved. Some day, we hope, they will be destroyed; but, as Dr. Hodgkin put it one day, this will take a long time, and we do not want to wait for that or spend all our energy in mere pulling down. We must leap over them. That is what we were doing at Bilkhoven.

These scattered impressions may best be summed up in the message sent out from the conference:

"God is our Father, therefore we are all brothers. For us there is one kingdom on earth—the Kingdom of God—and its law is love. Within this kingdom every nation finds its highest glory in bringing of its choicest and best to the other nations in joyful service. Let us open our eyes so that we may see this truth. Let all of us who have seen it clasp hands in a solemn vow never more to take up arms against our brothers or to make preparations for war.

"The earth that our Father has given us to live in is rich enough to supply the needs of all if we will but truly serve one another. Yet the nations are starving, and the need grows every day. Why? Because of our selfishness. We have striven to gather treasures for ourselves. But so to live is to take from our brother what God has intended for him. We believe it is our Father's will that the present social order—or rather disorder—should cease, and be replaced by a new order wherein the means of production will be used to supply the simple human needs of all mankind. Under a system of private capitalism this seems to us impossible. We believe the socializing of the chief means of production to be necessary. The goal of this economic renewal must be an order of society in which there will be no differences of class, but only men and women who work for the common good. During the process of change every effort should be made to avoid the dislocation of industry with the consequent chaos and distress. Brothers, let us help one another to bring about this revolution of love and righteousness with the weapons of love and righteousness.

"In the midst of the world's need a new generation is growing up. From the seed that the fathers have sown what harvest will the children reap? The King-

dom of God belongs to the children. Woe to us if we take from them what is theirs! Woe to us if we create in the minds of the children the old temper of enmity, lying, arrogance and vanity! Let us help one another to train the children simply to be men and women, glad and free, honorable and courageous.

"The revolution is here. The old world is crumbling. What will come: a new world, or world chaos? It all depends on the spirit that gives direction to the mighty current. There is only one spirit that is strong enough and pure enough to control these seething

forces and transform disorder into creative life: the spirit of the love of the Eternal Father which, in the Son of Man, has been revealed to us as sacrifice and forgiveness. This world revolution must become an uprising of the spirit of Christ against the spirit of Mammon. Therein only lies the salvation of the world.

"Out of the despair of mankind, out of the anxious hearts of men a prayer arises full of trembling hope; let us unite in this prayer, not only with words but in deed: Let *Thy Kingdom come now, our Father.*"

Great Democracies and Petty Democracies

By G. ARBAIZA

THE developments of the international conflict of Tacna and Arica during the last few months have led to the belief that another war is impending on the west coast of South America. We find in the situation, to be sure, elements that ordinarily enter into the outbreak of a war. We find a rancorous, revengeful Peru, vanquished and plundered by Chile in 1897, and stripped of rich territories by the invader; a strong, prosperous, militarist Chile, determined to keep the spoils, and prevent the military recovery of Peru; a weak Bolivia, shut off from the sea as a result of her war with Chile, and anxious to use somehow the conflict between Peru and Chile in order to recover an outlet to the Pacific.

However, there is no danger of war at present. The United States government will not allow an armed conflict that would be harmful to American commercial interests in the southern waters of the Pacific, where the annual figures of American trade amount to about two hundred million dollars. The expansion of capitalism, which led to many wars, sometimes may have to enforce peace.

The controversy between Peru and Chile dates from the War of the Pacific, fought about forty years ago. That war may be called the "Nitrate War." It was a capitalist enterprise. Chilean capital had opened up the valuable nitrate deposits of the Atacama desert. Bolivia then possessed a seaboard on the Pacific, a whole province, Antofagasta, large and rich in nitrate. Peru had also a province, Tarapaca, immensely rich in nitrate. Following technical disputes over the exploitation of the nitrate fields and over the guano deposits of Mejillones, Chile occupied a Bolivian port in February, 1879, and made war on Bolivia and Peru. When the war was over Chile had seized both provinces, Antofagasta and Tarapaca, and today the nitrate is the principal source of private and

public wealth in Chile. The exports of nitrate amount to approximately 75 per cent. of the total value of the Chilean exports. Chile was the producer of the powder and explosives with which the Allies carried on the world war.

Besides Tarapaca, Peru also gave up in the Treaty of Ancon the province of Tacna and its port, Arica, for ten years, a plebiscite at the end of that period to decide whether the inhabitants wished to return to Peru or continue under Chilean rule. Chile refused to fulfill this agreement. More than forty years have elapsed, and there has been no plebiscite. In fact, Chile took Tacna because she wanted a buffer province between Tarapaca and the Peruvian frontier in order to safeguard the conquered nitrate fields. The possession of the Tacna seaboard and Arica incidentally gave Chile control over one of the railroad routes of Bolivian trade, Bolivia having lost her own seaboard and remained an inland country.

Peru, powerless to attack Chile, confined herself to a diplomatic war during the last forty years, and when the League of Nations was formed, the Peruvian government saw a chance of bringing the controversy to the fore. It was on that occasion that the Bolivian government of Gutierrez Guerra, presumably influenced by the Chilean government, made a pronunciamiento at Paris and Washington claiming a geographical right on Arica, former Peruvian territory, as the shortest outlet for the Bolivian foreign trade. Although Bolivia, following a long-standing controversy with Chile, had recognized in 1904 the perpetual dominion of Chile over Antofagasta, there was a nationalist movement in Bolivia to undo what the war of 1879 did, and recover Antofagasta from Chile. The recent Bolivian revolution that deposed Gutierrez Guerra seems to have brought to power the leaders of the nationalist movement. Bolivia once again has

drifted from Chile and gone over to Peru, while Chile has mobilized her forces.

The advent of an anti-Chilean party to power in Bolivia does not mean that the Bolivian people make a revolution to dictate a different foreign policy. South of the Equator the revolutions are merely the fluctuations of an everlasting factional struggle between the politicians who are in power and control the public treasure, and the politicians who have lost control of the public treasure and feel the nostalgia of the government palaces. In this factional struggle the overthrown politicians have in some cases used an international situation to start a revolution and regain power.

In countries where the masses are mostly illiterate and suffer abject poverty, votes and democracy are only grotesque legends of a constitutional mythology. The factions settle their rivalry through revolution. The revolutionary leader is an abominable mixture of the bandit and the politician. Elections are held, indeed, but if the defeated faction is able to finance an uprising, the revolution will decide whether or not the polls have "expressed the sovereign will of the people."

During the last few years, however, most of these revolutions have shown a new feature. They have been practically bloodless *coups de main*. The Bolivian revolution was bloodless. This new development in the internal life of small countries whose wealthy classes largely depend upon the trade with great industrial countries, may be attributed to new conditions in the international field of finance. Both the faction in power and the revolting faction know the international complications of a long and bloody civil war, and fear that the international bankers and traders may stop credit and shipping. This is why whenever a revolution occurs in these days the victorious faction loses no time in cabling to the financial centers of the world that "the revolution has been bloodless and orderly," meaning that bankers, investors, and merchants ought not to feel alarmed.

The Indian population and the great majority of the working class in the western lands of South America are illiterate and live in misery. They have no national spirit, they are driven to revolution kindled by alcohol, they are driven to military service and war as are the slave Negro peoples of Africa, without even the excuses of patriotism. Among the wealthy and middle classes of the antagonistic countries in the Tacna conflict there is a deep national hatred inherited from the war of 1879; but the great aboriginal masses of the Andes have no notion of national boundaries, and are devoid of rancor.

Founded on the democratic principles of the great democratic nations of the world, the republics of Latin America have copied in their written political organization and their international life the democratic morals of the great democratic nations.

So they have military service, and they have warships, and they have secret diplomacy, and they have boundary disputes, and they have preparedness. The great democratic countries have great democratic wars. Why should not the small democracies also have theirs? For many years the Latin American revolutions were regarded as evidence of barbarism by the highly civilized and highly democratic nations of the world. When the most barbaric of all wars broke out in 1914 the Latin-Americans realized that, after a lesson of democratic principles, they had to learn from the great powers a lesson of barbarism.

And there are indications that the lesson has been well learned. The South American republics are now increasing their armaments, and adopting the most successful devices for mass homicide, the most effective machines for collective murder. There is not yet a race for hegemony among them, but there is a competition to be the strongest; there are not yet wars of expansion because the population is thin as compared with the territory, but there are jealousies, and diplomatic conflicts, and intrigues, and hatreds. The A B C never had a sound foundation, and vanished soon after coming to life. Chile maintained her militarist policy ever since her aggrandizement in 1879, and built up a powerful army and a strong navy with the product of the conquered riches.

The war industries of the great democratic nations have ripe markets in South America. The great powers stimulate the bellicose tendencies of the Latin-American republics whenever it is in their interest to do so. There are reasons, for instance, to suspect that Great Britain is behind Chile. The British interests in Chile are considerable. British capital set going the Chilean nitrate industry. Of the one hundred and fifty-four nitrate establishments existing in Chile before the war, sixty-three were owned by British concerns. England was, prior to the war, and is now presumably, the largest importer of Chilean nitrate. England is the builder of the Chilean warships, and has just sold to Chile what amounts to a small fleet "at an exceedingly low price," according to press reports.

Armaments make wars, and if the Latin-American republics go on arming at the present rate they will eventually feel tempted "to make South America safe for democracy."

A WHOLESOME kind of genuine cooperation between labor and the farmers is to be seen in the support certain trade unions are giving to the Bank of North Dakota, a State institution set up under the Nonpartisan League program. To finance the transportation of crops, certain western unions have transferred their funds from the ordinary banks to the Bank of North Dakota.

Open For Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

Jesus and Non-Resistance—An Answer to Mr. Mundell

I WAS very much struck with Charles Mundell's letter in the September WORLD TOMORROW in which, in spite of his thorough-going belief in the non-resistant point of view, he raises the question as to whether Jesus Himself consistently followed such a philosophy.

I wonder if Mr. Mundell's apparent difficulty does not come from an erroneous valuation of non-resistance. I feel sure that he would agree with me that a mere balancing of texts is not the proper method of approach to the problem, but that it is necessary to examine the spirit that was animating Jesus.

Looking at it from that point of view, it seems that Mr. Mundell's difficulty comes from considering non-resistance as an end in itself—a complete philosophy of life. He sees the conflict between the use of moral force and physical force, between the method of love and that of hate; and ranging himself properly on the side of the former, he has some doubts as to whether Jesus always did the same.

But with Jesus, if I read Him aright, it was not primarily a choice between two philosophies such as we face today, but rather the ultimate aim, which was uppermost. His chief concern was the redemption of erring, wilful, brutal men, individually and in groups, to a place in a Kingdom of brotherhood. To achieve that end He made use invariably of the appeal to conscience as the only thing which could accomplish the purpose on a lasting basis. He knew, apparently, that compulsion or retribution, no matter what surface reforms they might secure, only widened the breach between the evil spirit in the offender and the better order of life which should prevail. And just as He knew that the non-resistant attitude was bound to work eventually on the conscience of the evil aggressor, so He knew that white-hot scorn for quibbling, hypocrisy, and greed, on the part of one who lived above that sort of thing, was sometimes necessary to stir the sluggish consciences of those spiritually moribund. (In deference to Dr. Dole I might say that we are seldom, if ever, sufficiently clean-cut in our moral vision to indulge in denunciation safely.) He knew, too, the bitterness that would be brought into families because one member might follow His way; but, knowing, He did not conceal it or advise withdrawal from the path, since that bitterness would often be the best evidence of the working of conscience.

Read with that thought of the appeal to conscience as the primary consideration, it seems to me that the references cited in Mr. Mundell's letter simply emphasize Jesus' consistent attitude. Might I refer to William E. Wilson's *The Christian Ideal* as being an admirable exposition of the whole problem in its wider reaches?

PAUL JONES.

New York City.

THE WORLD TOMORROW has received numerous answers to Mr. Mundell's letter, which appeared in our last issue, of which we had been able to print only one owing to lack of space. We will endeavor to print additional answers in subsequent issues, and at any rate will see that all replies are forwarded to Mr. Mundell.

THE EDITORS.

A French Woman's Opinions on International Affairs

IN THE WORLD TOMORROW not long ago I saw a lament that so little was known of the minority opinion in Europe. It is because of that that I enclose this translation of a letter from a young French working girl which reached me recently.

Short Hills, N. J.

MARY KELSEY.

SINCE receiving your letter I have attentively observed the opinions and the tendencies of the various parties, and I shall try to give you a general idea on the questions that you present to me.

(1) What do the French Socialists think on the great question of the establishment of friendly relations with the Soviets?

Millerand recognizes Wraugel, an adventurer of whom, till now, the whole merit lies in drawing money from the Entente; and refuses to recognize the Bolshevik government, which is accepted by Russia and which, despite our interference, has existed for three years. It is a theatrical gesture and an idiotic imprudence for which we were not prepared.

The chief of the Ministry, pushed by the military party and by the capitalists, who still hope to force Russia into paying her enormous debt of nineteen milliards, which the downfall of the imperialist régime, the war, and the domestic situation makes impossible of payment, is attempting a stroke which brings to light the underhanded and imperialist policy followed by the government for several months. It is a provocation of war with Russia, our ally of yesterday, and it is a defiance of our friendship of today. Least of all, it seems to me, is England disposed to follow us in this dangerous and dishonorable direction.

The government press tries to misinform public opinion by articles directed against Russia, and the bourgeoisie permits itself to be led. But the proletariat sees clearly, and I hope that its energetic attitude will oblige our leaders to change their tactics.

(2) Do we think that the League of Nations as established by the Treaty of Versailles is really constituted for the welfare of the world, or is only a means of sustaining the capitalist governments?

The Treaty of Versailles contains only the ghost of the League of Nations as it was conceived by President Wilson. So as not openly to oppose this peace-making and noble idea, of which the complete application would have assured to the world a durable peace, the Allied governments have come out of the war with further

ideas of conquest, and in the hope of preserving their narrow and personal plans, have reduced this great and noble project into a little international office of limited power of which till now the achievement has been nil—as one sees in the case of the Orient. There is no real accord or disinterestedness, and the Allies of yesterday will easily become the enemies of tomorrow, if they find it to the advantage of their special interests. Since the League of Nations contains only the so-called conquerors, and as the United States will not be of the group, and as Germany is excluded, and as also war understood or declared exists against Soviet Russia, there can be no League of Nations, there can be no arbitration from possible conflicts, and nothing can protect us against the return of cataclysms such as that from which we have just issued.

(3) What did you think of the occupation of Frankfurt?

The nationalists, of course, were favorable to the occupation, but I must admit also that the liberal parties, without approving, did not show themselves very hostile. It was, it seems, the attitude of Germany which forced us to take this step. That is the reason given by the government, and we know no more than that, since the country is little informed of the policies followed towards Germany. For me, I deplored this act, which might have had the gravest consequences.

(4) What do you think of the present French government?

The present ministry is certainly not equal to the greatness of its task. It hesitates and oscillates to right and left, not knowing what to do to content everyone. This must be difficult enough, for the drastic measures which it has taken towards the working classes and the socialists makes it unpopular with labor. But the nationalists and capitalists, whose interests it supports, are very favorable to it and remain loyal to its foreign policy, which is both narrow and brutal, and contrary to the justice and the rights of peoples.

(5) How does the Feminist movement progress in France?

I took part lately in a meeting of Lexovien feminists. We were given the report of the annual Congress at Paris, and I saw with satisfaction that throughout the country there is a decidedly more favorable attitude towards the movement. Educated men of all shades of opinion are coming to our help, and the finest intellects among the women daily add to the number of those who are convinced. For the first time delegates from Alsace-Lorraine assisted at the Congress, and the President of the Strasbourg group, who was the spokesman, dwelt in particular on the extent of the feminist movement in Alsace-Lorraine, where there are important groups whose activity was not impeded even by the war. This information was a great consolation to me, as, on the contrary, our Norman country remains very backward. The reason is that we find ourselves in a region of backward opinion among minds timid and selfish, who see in the feminist movement a danger to the peace of the home, and even to the continuation of the nation. It is exceedingly difficult to combat such an attitude of mind, and our efforts are made the more fruitless because it is from women that we receive the greatest opposition.

Therefore the successful movement of other regions is a great compensation to us.

Our economic situation remains very grave, though we look forward to a general lowering of prices before long. Unfortunately we expect to benefit only a short time by this, as we will be overwhelmed by heavy taxes to pay the enormous budget caused by the war.

LOUISE MARTIN.

Lisieux, France.

Bertrand Russell's Lack of Vision

IN your comments upon Bertrand Russell's much discussed articles on Russia I looked in vain for some reference to Mr. Russell's strongly implied criticism of Lenin for being no more genuinely concerned with the interests of Russia than with those of other countries, and the implication that nationalism rather than internationalism was a salutary state of mind and could be a source of immense strength to the Bolshevik leaders. This, from such a source, was a most amazing thing.

Hardly less amazing is Mr. Russell's "historical parallel" of the Republic of Plato, which presupposed as a necessity a slave population, while the Bolsheviks under Lenin's far-visioned guidance are at least (and under enormous difficulties, be it remembered) working toward the achievement of a population that shall be industrially and politically free. Should not the aims and desires of the Bolsheviks be given more consideration, and their actions a little less, in the light of the fact that these actions are subject to the extreme pressure of internal differences and misunderstandings added to that of Allied ill-will and active intervention during the entire period since the overthrow of the Czar?

If Mr. Russell's estimate of conditions in Russia is no more profound than his estimate of Lenin, a man whose lack of "hauteur" leads Mr. Russell, apparently, to doubt his "eminence,"—it is hardly deserving of the praise it has received in some quarters. One is tempted to wonder how this critical study of a stupendous undertaking, written after a short visit and an hurried survey, would have been received by the reading public had the author been unknown and unrecognized.

Many of us who have admired Bertrand Russell the pacifist and socialist would have had him make a better attempt than he made in his widely read articles to understand, to vision, what the Bolshevik leaders have in their minds and in their hearts—these men and women who spare not themselves (as Mr. Russell admits), who volunteer for the most disagreeable and dangerous work, and who are willing to work sixteen hours a day. Their way is uncharted, but it is forward; the dangers and pitfalls are many, but their goal is high, and they are pledged to a creed of a better world and a nobler humanity. Mr. Russell the socialist was surely remiss when he failed so signally in putting forward this thought.

BLANCHET WATSON.

We Simply Must be Enthusiastic

PLEASE do not send me your paper again. I do not like a paper which has no enthusiasm for either of the two candidates, as one of them is going to be our next President. We should make our choice.

W. M. C.

The Last Page

ONE evening during my week's vacation ten of us, men and women from widely scattered parts of the country, were sitting round the fire in a camp in the Maine woods. Presently somebody starting talking about politics and in a few moments an informal straw-vote was being taken. This is how it came out:

A (a business man from Philadelphia). "I haven't made up my mind yet. I think I shall toss up for it on Election Day—heads for Harding, tails for Cox."

B (a well-known journalist in New York). "Oh, what's the use? I'd sell my right to vote for the rest of my life to anybody for a dollar and a half—and at that I'd be robbing them."

C (the wife of A). "I shall vote for Harding, because I think Coolidge has some good stuff in him."

D (an artist from somewhere in Connecticut). "If I vote at all, it will be for Debs, of course."

E (the wife of D). "I haven't made up my mind yet between Debs and Christensen."

F (a government official from Washington, D. C.). "I can't stand Harding at any price. I'd vote for Debs just to relieve my feelings, if I didn't think that Cox needed all the votes that he can get."

G (a school-teacher from Chicago). "It's a hopeless choice and I don't think I shall vote at all. But if I do, it will probably be for Debs because he is in jail."

H (an architect from New York). "Connt me out on this. I'm through with voting."

I (a doctor from Massachusetts). "I'm going to write Hoover's name on my ballot paper and let it go at that."

J (wife of I). "I hear that Mr. Cox's secretary is a far more able man than Mr. Harding's. I think I shall therefore vote for Mr. Cox."

From A to J these were all just plain average people with never a bolshevik thought lurking anywhere in their gray matter. I am curious to know whether this is the way most people are talking—if so it strikes me that the coming election may very well be the last!

THIS shortage of paper is a terrible thing. The Recruiting Bureau of the United States Army announces that it has been forced by lack of paper to discontinue temporarily its syndicate service to 2,800 newspapers throughout the country. It will rely for the present, it assures us, entirely upon its paid advertising. So that's where all those wonderful stories about the joys of army life come from! Well, one might have guessed it.

THE other day I came across an interesting old volume which bore on its stained and yellow title page these words, "A Fourme to be used in Common Prayer every Sunday, Wednesday and Friday through the whole Realme. Set forth by the most Reverende father in GOD Mathewe, Archbyshop of Canterbury, by the authoritie of the Queenes Majestie. 1566." Glancing through the ancient pages I noticed this prayer, which I carefully copied down:

"The Turke goeth about to set up, to extoll, and to

magnifie that wicked monster and damned soule, Mahumet. Wherefore, awake, O Lorde our God and heavenly father, overthrowe and destroy thynne and our enemyes."

Only our spelling seems to have changed since 1566.

NOW that the winter months are approaching I should like to commend to readers of this page a pleasant form of indoor sport to which I am much addicted. Every now and again, when the spirit moves me, as the Quakers say, I like to drop in at the Public Library and spend a quiet hour or so browsing through the columns of the foreign newspapers. It is astonishing what a number of remarkable things one can learn about the world in this way—things which the editors of our newspapers, being of a very choice and delicate mind, do not consider to be worthy to come within the scope of "all the news that's fit to print." Take, for instance, the recent annual meeting of the British Cooperative Congress. How many of our papers gave any adequate report of this really significant event? And yet here is an organization which now boasts a membership of 3,099,136, enrolled in 1209 Cooperative Societies, scattered throughout England and Wales, with capital funds amounting to well over a hundred million dollars, and with a record of net sales for the past year totaling nearly half a billion dollars. Here indeed is "big business," but with a difference.

I WAS re-reading the other day that strange, tantalizing fragment of Dickens' unfinished masterpiece, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*. It is many years since I last read the story and it seemed to me as fresh and enthralling as ever. One bit especially delighted me—the conversation between the Rev. Septimus Crisparkle and the Dean of Cloisterham, in which the Dean displays that high degree of caution which is so characteristic of gentlemen of the cloth. It is not too long for quotation here. The two clergymen are talking of young Neville Landless, who is under suspicion of having committed a murder:

"'Mr. Crisparkle,' quoth the Dean, 'human justice may err, but it must act according to its lights. . . .'

"'I am entirely satisfied of his perfect innocence, sir, nevertheless.'

"'We-e-ll,' said the Dean, in a more confidential tone, and slightly glancing around him, 'I would not say so generally. Not generally. Enough of suspicion attaches to him to—no, I think I would not say so generally.'

"Mr. Crisparkle bowed again.

"'I hope you do not object, sir, to my having stated in public emphatically' (said the minor canon) 'that he will reappear here. . . .'

"'Not at all,' returned the Dean. 'And yet, do you know, I don't think' (with very nice and neat emphasis on those two words), 'I don't think I would state it emphatically. State it? Ye-e-es! But not emphatically—No-o-o, I think not. In point of fact, Mr. Crisparkle, keeping our hearts warm and our heads cool, we clergy need do nothing emphatically.'

THE WAYFARER.

The Washington School



For Children of Superior Mental Ability

At the Washington School the maximum development of each child is assured through individual teaching, based on a scientific analysis of their physical, psychological and intellectual resources and needs. Through practice in social participation and co-operation they are prepared for leadership.

The school opens Sept. 27. Both boys and girls admitted to first six grades, but only girls to grades 7, 8 and 9. For particulars call or write

PHILIP W. L. COX, A.M., Head Master,
17 EAST 60TH STREET TELEPHONE PLAZA 4894

An expert advisory Committee assists the Headmaster and Trustees in the development of the school:

Dr. Otis W. Caldwell, Director, Lincoln School
Dr. Henry Carr Pearson, Principal, Horace Mann School
Dr. Thomas H. Briggs, Teachers College, Columbia
Prof. Patty Smith Hill, Teachers College, Columbia
Dr. N. L. Engelhardt, Teachers College, Columbia

Would You Vote for the Brotherhood of Man?

Would you vote for an order of social justice in the earth?

There is a new Third Party in the field which aims at justice. Farmers, wage-earners and social service workers combined to create this Party.

It is accused of standing for a class. Really it seeks to eliminate all classes.

You cannot vote with intelligence on November 2 without reading its platform. A postal card will bring it. Write today.

FARMER-LABOR PARTY

166 W. Washington St., Chicago, Ill.

READ THIS

THE BEST WAY TO TELL THE TRUTH IS TO EXPOSURE FALSEHOOD.

To all folks who have a sense of humor and can appreciate the absurdities of the present social and economic system, don't miss an issue of:



Edited by Art Young

"TO LAUGH THAT WE MAY NOT WEEP"

Out the 1st and 15th of each month. **GOOD MORNING** is the most fearless, hard hitting pictorial magazine of humor and satire published in America.

GOOD MORNING is not filled with heavy and tiresome reading, but with clever cartoons, bits of verse and brilliant epigrams. You'll want it and will be out of sorts if you don't get it; so fill out the coupon and mail in your subscription today. \$3.50 per year—\$1.00 for three months.

Good Morning Co., Inc., 7 E. 15th St., N. Y. City.
Enclosed please find..... for which send **GOOD MORNING** to

Name.....

Address.....

State.....

T. F. Hastings, Business Manager

HUMANITY FIRST

Humanity First, organ of the Live and Let Live League, stands uncompromisingly for the absolute abolition of interest as the only road now open for the salvation of the race. Each issue is full of interesting articles. Its inspiring motto is found in these words:

It is related that Napoleon, when shown an interest table said, after some reflection: "The deadly facts herein revealed lead me to wonder that this monster Interest has not devoured the whole human race." It would have done so long ago if bankruptcy and revolution had not acted as counter-poisons.—Michael Flurscheim.

Published by

J. B. BARNHILL

Xenia, Clay County,

Illinois.

Price 40 cents a year.

No free copies.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 11

NOVEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Japan and America

Do you know the nature of
Japanese Imperialism?

Is there a constructive solution
of the immigration problem?

Is there danger of war between
Japan and America?

These and similar questions are
here discussed by

Dr. Sidney Gulick
Robert Whitaker
and A Californian
Now Resident in Japan

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the November Issue.

	Page.
Signs of the Times.....	323
Japan and America:	
I. An Interview With Dr. Sidney Gulick	326
II. The Anti-Japanese Agitation in California. By Robert Whitaker	329
III. An Interview With a Californian Now Resident in Japan	331
What Can Religion Give Us Here? By John Nevin Sayre.....	334
Careers. By Zephine Humphrey.....	337
Watch the Denver Churches. By G. S. Lackland.....	339
Why We Do Not Support the League of Nations.....	340
Spiritual Resources in the Co-operative Movement. By Arthur Wallace Calhoun	341
A Letter to Protestant Ministers.....	343
Misunderstanding Outd Socialism. By Norman Ewer.....	344
France and the Arabs. By Edmund B. Chaffee	346
Open for Discussion.....	347
Ex-Libris	349

The World Tomorrow

Vol. III. November, 1920. No. 11.

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
115 East 28th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

Editorial Board of THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gora Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Rufus M. Jones, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Mellish, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrance, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union, \$2.00. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW at The Fellowship Press, 115 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 4, 1918, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

DR. SIDNEY GULICK, missionary to Japan since 1887 and author of numerous books about Japan, is now Secretary of the Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation.

ROBERT WHITAKER, minister of the First Baptist Church of Los Gatos, Cal., and the Universal Fellowship Institute, is securing the country at present in the interests of social welfare and good will. JOHN NEVIN SAYRE is an Episcopal minister, now connected with the Brookwood School.

ZEPHINE HUMPHREY is the author of numerous books and a contributor to current literature.

DR. G. S. LACKLAND is president of the Denver Open Forum.

ARTHUR WALLACE CALHOUN, a college professor and lecturer, gives courses on Cooperation at the Rand School.

NORMAN EWER is Foreign Editor of the London DAILY HERALD and English correspondent for the Federated Press.

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE, Presbyterian minister, for two years with the American Red Cross in the Near East, is now connected with the Labor Temple, New York City.

Again we want you to help us in increasing

the circulation of THE WORLD TOMORROW next month—December. It's a simple matter for you. Just decide which of your friends you think might subscribe. Then write us how many extra copies of THE WORLD TOMORROW you want for personal distribution to these friends. We will send you the copies free of charge. And we shall try to make the December issue especially suitable for this purpose. Of course, we still want the names of interested persons to whom we can send copies from our office. But your personal touch counts.

THE following books, reviewed in this and recent issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW, may be purchased through THE WORLD TOMORROW BOOK DEPARTMENT. Add to the price of the book 5% for postage east of Chicago, 8% west. Any excess postage will be refunded. Receipts from book sales go to the support of THE WORLD TOMORROW. The magazine will supply books of any publisher.

Prices of these books are subject to change by the publisher.

The Great Steel Strike, W. Z. Foster (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.75	Our Great War and the Great War of the Ancient Greeks. Gilbert Murray (Thomas Nelson).....	1.25
The Steel Strike of 1919 (Harcourt, Brace & Howe). Paper, \$1.50. Cloth.....	2.50	The Russian Republic. Colonel Malons (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00
A Guide to Russian Literature. Molensay J. Olin (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	3.00	"Barbarism" Soviet Russia. Isaac McBride (Thomas Nelson).....	2.50
Woman, Magdalena Marx (Thomas Nelson).....	2.00	The Unfinished Program of Democracy. Richard Roberts (B. W. Huebsch).....	2.00
The Beane, Joseph Conrad (Donohedy, Page & Co.). Cloth, \$2.00. Leather.....	2.50	What the Workers Want. Arthur Olson (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	4.00
Youth and the Bright Madonna. Willa Cather (Alfred A. Knopf).....	1.65	Facts and Fabrications About Russia. Evans Clark (Rand School, N. Y.).....	.50
Libull, Bomain Rolland (Boal & Liveright).....	2.00	Useful Wild Fights. Charles Francis Saunders (McBride).....	\$2.00
Easy Lessons in Einstein. Edwin E. Newton (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.55	Maupassant, Patrick MacGill (McBride).....	2.00
Darkwater. W. A. R. Dubois (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00	Life of General William Booth. Harold Begbie (Macmillan).....	10.50
The Rising Tide of Color. Lothrop Stoddard (Scrthorn).....	3.00	Now It Can Be Told, Philip Gibbs (Harper).....	3.00
The Centralia Conspiracy. Ralph Chaplin.....	.50	The Judgment of Peace. A. L. Lewis (Boal & Liveright).....	1.75
Rehearsal at Work. W. T. Gooda (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.00	The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan).....	3.00

RAND CORRESPONDENCE COURSES IN SOCIALISM and COOPERATION

For information write to 7 East 15th St., N. Y. C.

Room 381

Ask for Folder 700

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 11

NOVEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Signs of the Times

The Russian-Polish Peace

ONE must hail with joy the peace between Russia and Poland, even though that peace seems all too likely to be but a truce. The reconstruction of Central Europe was becoming a literal impossibility under the physical and spiritual conditions which attended the continuance of war. With returning health and coolness of mind it may yet be found possible to readjust the peace without again plunging the people into the widespread misery and disease which has attended the present war. Credit is due to the moderates both in the Soviet Government and in Poland for reaching this adjustment. So far as we can discover, Poland gains more than she had a right to expect. Her greedy landlords still keep their power over large groups of Lithuanian and White Russian peasants. The Polish corridor which is established with a view to separating Russia from Lithuania—and Germany—is not justified by any political or economic consideration. On the other hand, the Soviet government is now free to devote all its attention to General Wrangel, who with French backing was beginning to become somewhat formidable in the south, where he seems to have secured possession of valuable coal regions.

It is certain that the Polish chauvinists—junkers and Jew baiters—will not accept this peace as final. Their greed is too great. General Zeligowski, although repudiated officially by his government under stress of pressure from the Allies, doubtless acted with the approval of the Polish ruling class when he copied D'Annunzio and seized the Lithuanian city of Vilna. The Lithuanians are right in believing that the *coup* not only represents the nationalist ambitions of the Poles, but the economic desire of Polish landlords to keep their great estates, which would be taken from them under Lithuanian law.

Our Ally—Typhus

AS for internal conditions in Russia herself, one wishes for more light. To Americans the death by typhus of that brilliant writer and propagandist, John Reed, calls dramatic attention to the

terrible condition of the country. Typhus is a disease that flourishes only where hunger and misery abound. There are many reports of the weakening of Soviet power, of the discontent of the peasantry, and the like. The terms the Russians made with Poland perhaps indicate that there is some truth in the stories, although we have the authority of Mr. H. G. Wells, who has just been in Russia, for denying that there have been real revolts. We hold no brief for the perfection of the Soviet Government. We believe that force of circumstances under normal conditions would lead to its modification. But is there not something ghoulish in the exultation of our American newspapers over the misery of Russia? Henry Alsberg in his exceedingly illuminating article in *The Nation* points out how much of that misery is due to a lack of trained technicians and administrators. Half of this class, which under the Tsar numbered only three and one-half per cent. of the population, sabotaged the revolution. Those who can derive any moral satisfaction from the spectacle of trained men refusing to serve their countrymen because they dislike the form of government put themselves in a most extraordinary ethical position. But still worse are those who scornfully point to the disease that is rampant in Russia as proof of the failure of Bolshevism and raise no voice in protest against the near blockade—even against medicines—which our government and those of the Allies impose by their attitude toward the Soviets.

Socialist Imperialism

EUGENE V. DEBS was right in rejecting the socialist imperialism of the Third International. It is a great pity that the Russian communists have come so near to destroying our hope that the Third International might be a new rallying point for the working class. That the old Second International cannot become a virile, world-wide association is well-nigh certain, despite the defense of it made by Sidney Webb. The Third is vigorous. It has a record of achievement. In its condemnation of imperialism and its recognition of the importance of the country workers, it is on solid ground. The

trouble with it is not, as is commonly alleged, that it is too radical, but that it is too conservative. This is no paradox. The Third International seeks genuine revolutionary ends, but it cannot rise above the age-old human psychology in its conception of methods. The isolation of Russia and the conduct of her foes may explain the tests for affiliation laid down at Moscow, but they do not justify them. It is enormously difficult to discover a new technic of revolution, but this much is certain: they are doomed to bitter disappointment who believe that socialist or communist ideals can be secured by universal war (which is apparently presupposed by the Moscow program) and by the reassertion of the old principle of centralized dictatorship. Yet it is these methods which the Third International not only accepts but glorifies and makes of the essence of the communist faith. Modern warfare comes too near to race suicide and is too obviously destructive of the nobler side of man's nature to let any straight-thinking man hold to it with complacency as the means of our salvation. And when to war the Third International adds provisions for the dictatorship of Moscow over local activities of all socialist or communist parties, one can only despair that men learn so little of history. It is this undue centralization which invited revolution against the dominion of the Roman Empire and the Roman Church; it is this centralization which crushes out the life of the individual in modern industry. The whole problem of our time is to find a way of maintaining efficiency while promoting decentralization of power. In other words, we must discover a unity based on fellowship rather than on military discipline. On this score the Third International is not radical at all. It is as conservative as the great emperors and Popes of Rome, or as the modern industrial autocrats. One may sympathize with its desire to give socialism a vital and definite faith, but the fact remains that its dogmatism and intolerance are reactionary in effect and impose a terrible burden on mankind. Instead of uniting the socialist movement of Europe, the Third International is further dividing it. It may win such victories as it won in the Congress of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, but it wins them at a great price. Socialist unity requires either a definite modification of the Moscow manifesto or the birth of a new International. The only hopeful element in the situation is that Lenin and the Soviet Government act on so much more reasonable and cooperative a basis than the Third International professes.

More Light on Haiti

ONCE more is the Wilson administration showing how well it lives up to the first commandment of government, which is "Thou shalt save thine own face." General Lejeune's investigation whitewashed the American administration in Haiti.

Then came the publication of a letter from General Barnett, calling attention to indiscriminate killings of natives. After a few days, however, we are treated to an explanation from the aforesaid general in which it is made to appear that indiscriminate killing merely meant proceedings without due process of law, that he had no personal knowledge of the facts, and that his criticism applied only to a few men of the Marine Corps. If General Barnett is willing thus to qualify what he has written, other competent witnesses are not. More than ever it is necessary that there should be a full and open investigation not only of charges of cruelty against the American rule in Haiti, but of the more serious charge that our whole occupancy is a sin against the principle of self-government. Without pronouncing final judgment on the case in advance, it remains true that the charges of Mr. James Weldon Johnson and others are in themselves more convincing than the answers. Moreover, there is a *priori* reason to believe that Americans with their disgraceful prejudice against all black folk are not the best missionaries of law, order, progress, and justice in the black republic of Haiti.

The British Coal Strike

IN any other European country the British coal strike might portend a decisive struggle between revolution and reaction. Not so, we think, in England. The British genius for compromise will doubtless prevail. Already the miners' leaders are taking pains to show that the struggle is for wages with no class-war significance. Nevertheless, the situation as we write is sufficiently serious and can be understood only against the background of long negotiations in which Lloyd George has practiced some very clever double dealing. Apparently he has out-manuevered the miners for position in this conflict. Nevertheless, justice is not with him. The miners are striking for what they claim is a living wage, and they produce figures to show that increases granted them have scarcely kept up with the cost of living. In purchasing power their wages are worse rather than better than before the war, and they were then admittedly far too low for a proper standard of living. This is the first fact to bear in mind. The second is that despite Lloyd George's virtual pledge to put into effect the recommendations of the Sankey Coal Commission, private ownership continues. That celebrated inquiry did not leave much of a leg for the British private owners of the coal mines to stand on; yet lords and dukes whose original title was dubious enough in all conscience still take toll of the labor of miners and the needs of consumers. However anxious British labor may be to settle the nationalization issue by political rather than direct action, by reasonable compensation rather than downright expropriation of the present owners, this is certain:

neither in Great Britain nor in America can there be real peace or efficiency in the coal industry while the possession of the title deeds gives men and women the rights of ownership over an essential industry to which they have contributed no mite of knowledge, labor, or skill.

Solid Ivory in Trade Unionism

THERE is something so startling as to be almost magnificent about Mr. Samuel Gompers' devotion to old-line trade unionism. At the moment labor unionism is on the defensive in almost every industry fighting for its life against the anti-union movement, disguised as the "open shop" or "American movement," Mr. Gompers has time to issue a manifesto denouncing not merely the Russian communists, but practically all shades of organized labor on the European continent. If his audacity is admirable, less can be said for his wisdom. Old-line trade union tactics pure and simple are in this age and generation neither adequate for labor nor socially serviceable. Mr. Gompers and his cohorts have a certain strength, but they are anything but strong enough to buck employers on the one hand and the opinion of the organized labor of the world on the other.

An Illuminating Investigation

THE New York legislative inquiry into housing has made a good beginning. Mr. Samuel Untermyer has seemingly unearthed a conspiracy on the part of the employers to profit to the utmost out of the needs of the public. Labor plays no glorious role in the hearings. Evidence has been heard which seems to show that it also has played the game solely for its own advantage and has been willing to accept the outrageous leadership of Mr. Brindell, who receives some \$30,000 a year for his services, simply because Brindell has the knack of bringing home the bacon. It must be said frankly that the attitude of labor organized in the building trades council is both short-sighted and anti-social. Yet it is precisely these building trade workers who have been the bulwarks of the "conservatism of real labor" which is so often praised in the daily press.

Secretary Colby's Closed Diplomacy

MORE notable even than the deadly mediocrity of the Democratic-Republican campaign is its lack of realism. Political spell-binders and even intellectual advocates of the League of Nations like Dr. Eliot of Harvard talk in general terms of justice, peace, disarmament, and the like. But they do not discuss actual economic conditions and the passions which stir men's hearts. They talk, for example, of open diplomacy to be secured through the League of Nations, but pass unnoticed Secretary Colby's high-handed action in excluding Messrs. Hanna and Todd, the two correspondents of the Federated Press (which serves the liberal and rad-

ical papers of America), for no other crime than because Mr. Hanna was preparing a statement as to the way in which those who handle our foreign affairs mishandle the news, garble the facts, and avoid responsibility. Doubtless Messrs. Hanna and Todd do not regret being deprived of the light of Mr. Colby's wisdom, for that light has been darkness; but the autocratic principle upon which he, our Secretary of State, acts is in absolute antithesis to the open diplomacy our President once preached.

A Fight for Free Speech

THE last few weeks have seen an interesting development in the campaign for civil liberties. The protagonists have been the mayors of various towns in Connecticut and New York on the one side, and on the other local socialists or other radicals and such representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union as Bishop Paul Jones of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Mrs. Elizabeth Glendower Evans of Boston, Miss Rose Schneidermann, candidate for the United States Senate on the New York Farmer-Labor ticket, and the Rev. John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church. The situation is this: In various towns, with or without ordinances, local mayors have taken it upon themselves to deny all permits for street meetings. The move is directed at socialists or other radicals and is often camouflaged by a plea about protecting traffic. If mayors have a right on their own whim to prevent street meetings, freedom both of speech and of assemblage is unreal. Our revolutionary forefathers certainly did not fight for the right to hire a hall, a right which is no right at all as far as poor radicals are concerned. It is on this basis that the mayors' acts have been challenged. In Mt. Vernon, New York, where there was a particularly obnoxious ordinance, obnoxiously enforced, two test cases were made. In the first Mrs. Arthur Garfield Hays and two Mt. Vernon socialists were arrested. In the second the victims were Miss Schneidermann and Messrs. Holmes and Thomas. The first case was taken on writ for *habeas corpus* before Judge Keogh of the Supreme Court of New York, who declared the local ordinance unconstitutional. Accordingly both sets of defendants were released. The City of Mt. Vernon announces that it will appeal the case, but friends of civil liberty everywhere are encouraged by the result thus far attained.

The Commission on Ireland

WE are happy to announce that *The Nation's* Committee of 150 on Ireland has elected as its Commission of Inquiry Miss Jane Addams, Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts, ex-Governor Folk of Missouri, James Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, and Frederic C. Howe, former Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York. Two others may later be added.

Japan and America

I. An Interview with DR. SIDNEY GULICK

THE WORLD TOMORROW has already commented on the anti-Japanese legislation which it is probable will be enacted by the people of California at the coming election. The significance of this legislation and of the growing anti-Japanese feeling in America cannot easily be exaggerated. The problem is complicated and does not permit off-hand judgment. It involves the whole question of racial relations, of immigration, of conflicting imperial aspirations. For this reason THE WORLD TOMORROW has set itself to secure opinions on the many phases of the subject from competent observers. We publish these opinions this month and invite discussion. We are expressly refraining from editorial comment until after the evidence has been put before our readers.

Q I am particularly anxious to give readers of THE WORLD TOMORROW definite news about Japan, for it seems to me that no foreign question is more grave than that of our relations with Japan. May I begin by asking you your opinion of Premier Hara?

A. Mr. Hara, by Japanese standards, is a liberal or a progressive. I believe that in his relations to foreign powers he is neither a junker nor an imperialist.

Q. You say he is a liberal. Did he not, however, defeat a universal suffrage bill twice in the Diet?

A. Yes, that is true. When universal manhood suffrage was first proposed in the Diet he opposed it not on principle, but on various grounds of immediate expediency, among others the fact that the issue had never been properly before the electorate, and also because the electorate had been practically doubled by a law passed only a year earlier. After some stormy scenes and demonstrations amounting almost to riots the Diet was dissolved and a new election was held. Hara's party was continued in power and again he defeated suffrage on the ground that until the new body of electors was incorporated into the governmental machinery universal suffrage would be unwise. I think in view of Japanese conditions he was right.

Q. I have some questions to ask with regard to foreign policy. If Mr. Hara is not an imperialist, how are we to explain the Japanese program in Korea, Siberia, and China?

A. The Imperialistic policies and militaristic pro-

grams of the Japanese Government in Korea, China, and Siberia, of which the world justly complains, were adopted long before Mr. Hara became Premier. He has inherited them from anti-liberal bureaucratic predecessors. In all directions he has been introducing liberal policies and reforms. In Korea he has made a beginning in substituting civil for military government. Many important reforms are under way there. Japan's policies toward China are also undergoing a fundamental change. It is to be remembered that in Japan, as in other lands, there are powerful opposition parties seriously interfering with the new policies which Mr. Hara would like to carry out. The military party, moreover, is peculiarly entrenched in the government, the ministers of War and of the Navy being responsible not to the Premier, but technically to the Emperor alone—actually to the "elder statesmen." The General Staff can undertake operations without the consent or even the knowledge of the Premier. In a real sense Japan still suffers from dual control. It is quite certain that Mr. Hara did not know about some of the military events in Siberia until after the event; as for instance the sending of the large number of troops beyond the amounts mutually agreed on by the American and Japanese governments in the summer of 1918 took place before he became Premier.

Q. Is it true, as is repeatedly charged in Chinese dispatches, that Japanese intrigue was directly responsible for the attempt of the Anfu club to assert its controlling power over the Chinese Government?

A. I have no private information. But I am inclined to accept those charges in spite of the fact that when Mr. Hara began his government he declared his intention to renounce the old Japanese policy of intrigue with various Chinese factions. At any rate, the Anfu faction has recently suffered defeat.

Q. To shift the discussion now to American relations with Japan: Is it your opinion that the Japanese government wants unrestricted immigration to America?

A. Decidedly not. The government would be opposed to it not merely, as is sometimes charged, because it wishes to keep its own young men for military service, which may or may not be true, but also because it is realistically

minded and knowing the existence of race prejudice does not want to inflame American feeling. For economic reasons if for no others the Japanese government emphatically wants no war with the United States. It has loyally carried out the Gentlemen's Agreement and more recently has stopped the emigration from Japan of so-called "picture brides." [Japanese unmarried men in California wishing to marry send their photographs to their families or "go-betweens" in Japan and receive the photographs of the young women selected to be their wives. When both parties are satisfied, the legal marriage is made in Japan by transferring the police registry of the bride from the home of her parents to the home of the parents of the groom. She then can get a passport and can sail for America, because she is the "wife" of a Japanese in California. Wives admitted to America under these circumstances are called "picture-brides."]

Q. Is it true that pressure of population is such that Japan must have an outlet for emigration?

A. No, it is not absolutely true. It is true that the population in Japan per square mile of *cultivable* land is extraordinarily high—higher than in any great nation (2,688 per square mile). Nevertheless, the Japanese government itself has recently announced, as reported, the opening of five million acres of new farm land. The northern island of Hokkaido is still sparsely inhabited. Moreover, Japan, like England, might have an industrial development which would absorb a great many more of her population in industrial centers. England has natural resources of coal and iron which, however, Japan lacks. Hence it is a matter of life and death for the rising industrialism of Japan to have access to raw materials either through a liberal world trade policy or through a conquest on her part of great economic resources.

Q. Is it true that Japanese will not emigrate save to fertile lands in temperate zones?

A. Yes, it is approximately true. Even the development of the Japanese island of Hokkaido has gone on slowly. It is doubtful if many emigrants would go to Siberia. Nor do they like the tropics. They have not colonized Formosa, and in the event that they took the Philippines the Japanese might exploit the islands but they would no more colonize them than have the Americans. Even to Korea emigration has been comparatively slow, although it has been encouraged by the government. In 1915, out of a population of nearly 16,000,000 in Korea, there were only 303,000 Japanese. The pressure of population in Japan is not yet great enough to make the Japanese go where conditions do not seem to them the most favor-

able. Even the emigration to California was originally stimulated by profiteering agencies of one sort or another who by spreading wild tales of great fortunes to be won in America persuaded Japanese youths to mortgage their property and their future in order to secure passage to this land of boundless wealth.

Q. Is the Japanese immigrant to the United States assimilable?

A. Your question requires definition. We must make a sharp distinction between psychological assimilation, which depends on education in the largest sense, and biological assimilation, which can come only through intermarriage. As for the former, educational assimilation, Japanese are just as assimilable as any immigrants from the countries of Europe. Given the proper opportunities and surroundings, and there can be no doubt of their wholesome response. Not only their clothing and housing and living standards will be American, but so also will be their conceptions of God and man, of parents and children, of morals and religion, of the state and the citizen. From my residence in Japan and from my experience with immigrant peoples, I should say the Japanese children of the second generation (who present the real test) were fully as assimilable as the children of most of the European races. This is certainly true where they have the chance to go to American schools. The children are proud of knowing English, and the average Japanese father and mother cannot teach them enough Japanese to compete with the English they learn in school. American-born and educated young people fifteen to twenty years of age understand an English lecture, address, or sermon much better than a Japanese one. They wear American clothes, they adopt American standards of living. [Here Dr. Gulick showed me some rather striking pictures of Japanese homes, and Japanese families in California.] The fear of the Japanese birth rate is exaggerated. For instance, during the year 1918, according to the Report of the California State Board of Control, 524 "picture brides" entered the state. By the end of 1919 only 182 of them had had a child. That hardly fits in with the Phelan fable, which has scared the people of California badly, that "picture brides" have a baby once each year. It is doubtful whether any healthy race would show a much lower birth rate, under corresponding economic conditions.

What I have been saying about assimilability applies to the Japanese who settle here, especially those who come while they are young, and, above all, to the children. It is true that many Japanese who came as adults expected to return to the old country, and have done so.

Between July 1, 1908, and June 30, 1919, 13,570 more males have left America than have entered. Often these men were heavily indebted to Japanese immigration agencies; their standard of living was of course low. These cases gave rise to prejudice. That prejudice is not warranted. It is surely unreasonable to segregate the Japanese by hostile and social ostracism and then complain that they are clannish.

There is, of course, another side to the question of assimilation, namely, the biological one. One does not need to believe that the Japanese are in any way an inferior race to believe that the progeny of mixed marriages may be inferior. Sometimes the mating of stocks good in themselves makes for improvement biologically, sometimes for deterioration. Unfortunately, most mixed marriages of Americans and Asiatics are under such social, economic, and ethical conditions as to account for low standards of family life. Where the marriages have been on a high plane, the results in terms of family life have on the whole been satisfactory. The truth is, this whole matter needs to be scientifically studied. I have recommended the establishment of a commission of experts with an appropriation adequate for this end. At any rate, it does not necessarily follow that friendly relations between the races must depend upon general intermarriage.

- Q. This leads me to my most vital question. I am aware that you are advocating a general plan for dealing with immigration which will solve the Japanese problem. I should like to explain that plan to our readers.
- A. Yes, I believe that it is quite possible to solve the Asiatic immigration problem on the same general plan as that to be applied to the European, thus avoiding obnoxious discrimination. The dangers in unrestricted immigration of any sort are economic and social. Immigrants keep on coming in slack times. The adjustment of supply and demand is slow. Adult immigrants cannot be assimilated rapidly. Your own experience will tell you that it is very hard for adults who have to engage in manual labor to learn a new language. In other words, neither from an economic nor from a social standpoint is it well for a nation to admit an indiscriminate number of any alien group no matter how high may be their racial quality. The proposal that our National Committee makes is that a federal immigration board be established composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, the Interior, Agriculture and State, who will secure from each state accurate information on economic and social conditions in order to determine yearly in advance the number of immigrants who may

wisely be admitted. The law we propose further provides that the Board shall not admit in any one year a number of immigrants from a given people in excess of ten per cent. of the number of residents of that people who have become American citizens, and their children. That is to say, if there are 100,000 Italians already pretty well accustomed to American conditions who have become American citizens, they can influence wholesomely 10,000 new Italians better than they could 50,000 or 100,000. If there are 10,000 Chinese who are American citizens, the Board could admit, if it thought desirable, 1,000 Chinese immigrants in a single year, but not more than that number. Since the present number of Asiatic immigrants who have become American citizens is very small, no great increase would be possible on this plan. The Board would decide the number for each people in the light of the experience with that people. There would then be no racial discrimination as such to affront high-spirited peoples. The Board, moreover, might completely stop the immigration of any given people, but if it should do so, it would not be on the ground of race difference, but entirely on the ground of definite, ascertained experience—economic, social, and assimilational.

- Q. Your plan has always interested me. I have some questions to ask. The first is a practical one. Do you believe a federal Immigration Board would be competent to handle so great a human problem?
- A. I do not say the Board could handle it perfectly, but I believe that a Board of the sort I have named would be able to regulate immigration in a far wiser way than our present laws permit. The very effort of the Board to get information would be highly beneficial; it would necessitate the securing of accurate figures and an intelligent forecast of industrial conditions.
- Q. My next question refers to the Californians. Your plan has been bitterly attacked there. What chance is there that its adoption would end the agitation?
- A. If California should realize that this bill would make possible the complete stoppage of all Japanese immigration, that under this law we would determine their immigration by our own laws and our own decisions, and that therefore the Gentlemen's Agreement would be abrogated, most of the grounds for the present agitation would be removed. This bill, moreover, by raising the standards for naturalization and by giving the privileges of citizenship to all who qualify would in the course of a few years result in our having several hundred and

possibly a few thousand highly intelligent, able, and patriotic American citizens. Their conduct would refute the charges now hurled at them that they do not become good citizens. Since we do not permit them to become citizens at all, these charges are absurd. When they have had the opportunity of showing what good citizens they make—how loyal to American interests, both local and national—the unreasoning fear which many now have would be removed. Under such conditions scheming politicians would find little opportunity for agitation.

Q. My final question is on rather different grounds. I cannot believe that we are ever to reach the solution for any of our problems until we can assert a brotherhood which transcends national and racial prejudices. Can you assert such a brotherhood under a restrictive program? Is it fair for those of us who occupy a rich and prosperous country to refuse to receive our fellow men who desire to come to us to share in its development? Doesn't any systematic denial of the right of men to work where opportunity offers in the long run lead to strife and even to war itself?

A. I am in hearty agreement with your fundamental ideals. A legislative program, however, must bring ideals into contact with the hard facts of reality. These include race difference, race ignorance, race rivalry, and race prejudice. While these are chiefly psychological phenomena, they are fact of a peculiarly intractable character. A legislative program that would immediately secure absolutely free immigra-

tion to America from every race and people, regardless of differences of economic, social, and civilizational life, would at once plunge America into difficulties beyond calculation or control. It would inflame rather than reduce race feeling. Frightful unbrotherly conflicts would be promptly precipitated. For the present, therefore, *the statesman who would be at once idealistic and practical must adopt some plan for the wise regulation of immigration.* No country can afford or permit an immigration beyond its power wholesomely to assimilate and steadily to employ the newcomers. America has a service to render the world. To make our democracy a success we must have a population that is fairly homogeneous. Unrestricted immigration, Asiatic or other, would make this impossible. Because men ought to be brothers it does not follow that in the present state of the world nations should not set up certain standards for the regulation of immigration in the interest of the social group as a whole. Extreme idealism at this juncture advocating complete and absolute freedom of immigration merely plays into the hands of the ultra-nationalists and rabid restrictionists. The program of our National Committee injures and humiliates no nation and no race. It does not profess, moreover, to be a panacea. It merely proposes to deal with one of our difficult problems by the application of universal principles. In this, as in every other problem of social welfare, the Golden Rule is the only safe guide.*

II. The Anti-Japanese Agitation in California

By ROBERT WHITAKER

THE anti-Japanese agitation in California is much more than either personal or local. Senator Phelan of San Francisco and Editor McClatchy of Sacramento are the two most prominent protagonists of it. The one is a politician, the other the editor of a daily paper. Whoever knows American politics and the American daily press will not hold these things to their advantage, and will be inclined to discount the men accordingly. But both of them have the reputation in California of being exceptionally independent men and have impressed the public as being more than commonly public-spirited. I have some acquaintance with them both and do not know of anything to indicate that either of them has any personal grievance against the Japanese.

So far as the local factor is concerned, California has kept the ill reputation of her former anti-Chinese riots of a generation ago. This tends to discredit the anti-Japanese agitation in the eyes of

many on the outside; but the present agitation is very different from that of forty years ago. It has no such basis in the ill-feeling of the working classes, and it is much more serious because the sources of it lie much farther back in the whole present national and world situation. Those who complain of California as disturbing the nation with her anti-Japanese agitation and legislation and who think that Californians do not take into account sufficiently the fact that the whole nation is likely to have to settle or to saddle any trouble which they make between themselves and Japan need to remember that the present anti-Japanese movement in California grows out of the national program and publicity work of the last three or four years.

*I shall be glad to send copies of our bill (H. R. 14196) and of explanatory pamphlets to such readers of THE WORLD TOMORROW as may be interested in familiarizing themselves with our proposals. Let them address the National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation (enclosing ten cents for postage), at 106 East Twenty-second street, New York City. SIDNEY GULICK.

The anti-Japanese agitation in the first place is a part of the general increase of the suspicions and antipathies begotten by the Great War. You can no more conduct a war without hatred and fear than you can run an automobile without oil and gasoline. California shared with the rest of the nation the campaign of hatred and fear toward Germany. Germany as an objective has ceased to interest the Californians now. They were never as near to Germany as were the people of the eastern states, and therefore it was easier for them to change the objective of the education they had received. And this in brief is what has happened. California's Germany just now is Japan. The imperialism of Japan is not less autocratic than was the imperialism of Germany, and the menace of Japan, so far as California's interest is concerned, seems, to many of our timid people especially, much more imminent. Why should it be reckoned strange, therefore, that the sort of thing which all our moral leaders as well as our political guides have been cultivating in the American people has flourished in the case of California in an attitude of exaggerated distrust and enmity toward the rising imperial power of the East?

The second factor which has to do with the anti-Japanese agitation in California grows out of the profiteering which characterized the war period. The lust for loot, whether loot of the enemy's territory or loot of those at home by patriotic profiteers, is as much a part of a war program as hatred and fear. And California has not been exempt from the operation of the speculative and plundering spirit. There may not have been the same opportunities for graft in California which there were in other sections of the union, but the inflation of prices has nowhere been more marked than it was on the Pacific Coast. Especially is this the case in California with reference to land values. Men and women who have invested a few hundreds or a few thousands at the most have within the last few years turned over their property quickly for a sufficiently increased figure to assure them of a livelihood for a lifetime. Real estate men naturally have reveled in this opportunity to reap commissions. And property was hardly sold for an extravagant figure when some real estate man was ready to sell it again for a more extravagant figure.

Now, naturally there has been some nervousness among careful people over this rapid rise in prices. Somebody is bound to suffer one of these days when these rising prices suddenly stop and people who have mortgaged everything in support of deferred payments are no longer able to meet their obligations, but stand to lose all that they have invested. In this situation the Japanese have been very handy investors. They could afford to take longer chances than the white man because they could live at a lower level of subsistence and stood a better

chance, therefore, to pay out even if the land boom collapsed. Generally speaking, they did not buy to speculate, but to hold the land and cultivate it, whereas the white man had no concern about cultivating if he could make more by looting some of his neighbors of an extra price. The further factor in the situation was the solidarity of the Japanese, who were generally so associated in their business ventures that they were not likely to see any of their number suffer actual loss of the holdings he had secured. Consequently many a ranch which might have waited long for a customer of the white race to pay the price that was asked has been sold to men of the brown race who were not too particular about the price if they could get hold of it. I charge the real estate speculator and the whole speculative spirit of landlordism as being responsible in very large measure for the increase of Japanese land holdings in California.

But probably the largest factor in the anti-Japanese feeling in California is the developed sense of nationalism which has brought about a more or less unconscious rise of the imperialistic spirit in America. The thing really goes deeper than either of the two factors I have described. The rise of anti-Japanese feeling is coincident with the rising thermometer of American jingoism, and both are affected by the same causes.

Undoubtedly the great body of the American people, although they recognize that something is wrong, still believe in the economic order under which we live; but they are not wholly agreed in their reaction to it. There is a comparatively small class who are internationalists, wanting to see the whole world in one League of Nations somewhat after the fashion of our union of states, and quite willing that America shall play in such a union no more prominent part than New York, for instance, plays in the union of our states. There is another considerable group with more commercial instincts and associations who are inclined to an Anglo-Saxon alliance that would make all the English-speaking peoples reasonably secure against war among themselves, and who would be willing to admit other nations into such an alliance only so far as the dominance of the Anglo-Saxon strain could be conserved. But there is a much more numerous group who, whether they define their positions or not, are for America as the dominant commercial power of the world. They have no desire to overthrow the present economic system; they simply want to make America "cock of the walk." Some of them state the matter in generous terms. One man in southern California of more than usual intelligence and generosity remarked to me that he would like to see America rule the world because he believed that she would rule well. But there are a great many more who are concerned to see America rule whether she rules well or not, simply because they

are Americans and have adopted the philosophy, "my country, right or wrong."

Now this spirit prevails to a large extent quite naturally on the Pacific coast, especially in California. We are accustomed to boast the superiority of our climate over that of other states, to boast of our abundant natural resources, and to think of California as about the best thing in America. It suits us finely to think of America as quite certainly the best thing in the world. And at bottom I believe this is the real thing that is stirring up ill-will toward Japan among the "America for Americans" type of Californians. Since we have gotten rid of Germany as a dangerous rival for economic supremacy of the world, there is a feeling now that Japan and England are the principal rivals who are left in the field. The Irish situation is keenly felt in California, and the anti-English feeling is growing quite as rapidly as the anti-Japanese feeling, but it does not happen to be in the papers quite so much for reasons that are fairly obvious. And, after all, Japan is for the Californians the principal competitor that America has for the markets of the world. I do not mean for a moment that big business in California is conscious of this thing as openly as I have stated it. I talked with one of the leading officials of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco who had recently returned from Japan just before I left California, and his attitude was tolerant, fair-minded, and generous to a remarkable degree; and I think that the majority of the really responsible business people of California are disposed to go slowly in stirring up popular antagonism toward Japan. But such people utterly failed to keep us out of the war with Germany, although we were assured by distinguished pacifists like David Starr Jordan that the great financiers of the world could not afford a world war and would not allow it to come to pass. It did come to pass, and it came to pass through the combined unwisdom and intolerance of the politicians and the propagandists of jingoism.

The politicians and the propagandists of jingoism in California are running ahead of the more serious-minded business folks and are threatening to run away with the popular mood toward England and "the Germany of the East." Ultimately the cause of California's agitation against the Japanese are economic. They are the natural responses of a state such as California toward the inevitable conflict of interest between American imperialism and the imperialism of Japan.

Politicians such as Senator Phelan do not understand this point of view and they will try to meet the situation by pious political persiflage; and there is no doubt that Senator Phelan in this respect represents more Californians than I do. The churches in California will deprecate all talk of war with Japan; the press will speak softly about it. There

are many idealists who will pray over it and talk piously in the hope of thereby preventing it. But the causes which are making for trouble between the United States and Japan are not to be prayed or preached out of the way unless our praying and preaching go a good deal deeper than words. And our preaching has to do with a good deal more than pious sentiments. If we continue our present economic system there is no reason whatever to believe that conflict with Japan will grow less acute. She is increasing the area of her exploitation of the world. We are increasing the area of our exploitation of the world. She wants the markets of the East and so far as she can get them the markets of the West. We want the markets of the whole world. Racial feeling will undoubtedly contribute to intensify the opposition. Our inheritance of hatred and suspicion from the Great War will make it easy for us to feel unneighborly toward Japan. The itch for profit of the land speculator will serve as the contributing cause to the disturbance of our relations with a people as thrifty and as capable as the Japanese who are able to take more off the land when they get it and to live on less. These are all items of no small importance.

But the main trouble is not here; it is rooted just where I have put it. The Great War may have ended Germany as a competitor with America for the markets of the world, but it has increased the power of England, it has increased the power of Japan, and it has drawn sharper lines between us and England and between us and Japan; and just as here on the east coast there is an interest in the League of Nations not to be found in California because here there is greater sensitiveness to the need for some alliance between America and England, so on the Pacific coast there is an increased sensitiveness to the world relations which concern us and Japan. We do not think of a League of Nations with Japan included, unfortunately, anything like as easily as we think of a League of Nations with England included. But neither the Irish question in the East nor the land question in California is at the bottom of the menace of war between America and England and between America and Japan. The real menace is a world situation which builds up enormous fortunes in every one of the great dominant nations, fortunes which can only be continued and increased by a further exploitation of the markets of the world; and therefore the master class in the master nations are continually, whether conscious of the matter or not, in the attitude of rivals armed to the teeth and ready at any instant to draw the sword or gun and to begin war's bloody business all over again. Only as we build a brotherhood society on the basis of the workers' control of the world's work shall we have any assurance of permanent peace between America and Japan.

III. An Interview With a Californian Now Resident in Japan

Q. I have been very much disturbed by conflicting reports as to the character of the Japanese government and the movement of social forces in Japan. One of our correspondents represents Mr. Hara as a liberal struggling against odds. Is this in your opinion true?

A. I thought it was until this last few months. Now I should hesitate to call Mr. Hara or his cabinet liberal. The best explanation of the situation is that for the first time we have in Japan a business man's cabinet, that industry and enterprise rather than the old feudal bureaucracy are in the saddle. For the present, party government holds sway for the first time in Japan. Nevertheless, it is a mistake to believe that the influence of the famous Satsuma and Choshu clans who made the new Japan is dead. On the contrary, Hara could not long hold power without their consent. When his ministry falls, it is quite likely the bureaucracy will come in again. The elder statesmen, though only Prince Yamagata and Marquis Matsukata remain of the original Meiji Era group, still have power. The constitution was drafted so as to prevent real party government with a cabinet accountable to the Diet, and it can only be changed by the Throne. It will require an overwhelming popular demand to bring about amendment.

Q. What do you think is the relation of the Hara government to the military?

A. It is hard to say. As you know, the army is not responsible to the civil cabinet. The ministers of War and Navy must be a general and an admiral respectively and are responsible only to the Emperor. It is possible that Hara and his Foreign Minister have not had power to approve, but rather to condone the acts of the military in Siberia and China. Hara's one real title to credit is that he has made considerable reforms in Korea in the direction of civilian rather than military control.

Q. What is the strength of Japanese militarism?

A. It is much less popular than it was. The defeat of Germany was a setback to the militarist party and to militaristic ideals. If America had entered the League of Nations and that organization had become operative more promptly and vigorously, Japanese militarism would have received a further setback. Even as it is, the army has greatly declined in popular esteem. For instance, there has been an absolute decline of about 3,000 in applications for admission to the officers' training schools since 1917—2,000 in 1918 and 1,000 in 1919. The brightest young men are less likely to look forward to a military career than formerly,

and popular sentiment is against extensive use of the army on the Asiatic continent. Militarism also received a check in its relations with China when the Consortium headed by Mr. Lamont was formed and when the Anfu party, which was generally understood to be subsidized by the Japanese, was defeated.

Q. Do you mean that present tendencies in Japan are really pacifist?

A. No, I mean that professional militarism is less influential than it was. The business interests, however, see or think they see (in the present state of the world) the necessity for establishing an economic imperialism. Japan must have her concessions, her spheres of influence, her control of raw material to match the western nations. To do this there must be an efficient army and navy, especially if the European powers and the United States keep up their military establishments. There is, therefore, little hope of the real death of militarism.

Q. Do I understand, then, that Japan seeks an economic rather than a political empire in Asia?

A. Yes. Her people are not likely, at least for many years to come, to colonize Siberia or Manchuria. They have not colonized Korea to any great extent, but economic empire—the control of raw materials and concessions—are of enormous import to the growth of Japanese industry. If stricter exclusion is adopted in the United States, as California proposes, it may force a steadily growing emigration of Japanese to the Asiatic mainland, the East Indies, and South America.

Q. We hear much of labor unrest. To what extent does that check Japanese militarism?

A. Not much at present. There is labor unrest. It is growing in intensity. The conditions under which Japanese labor lives are bad. The cost of living has risen between two hundred and three hundred per cent. in the last five years. Wages on the whole have not kept pace. Meanwhile, the Japanese working classes, as in western countries, are less and less content with the bare level of subsistence. Although strikes are checked by the police and genuine trade unions are still under the ban, there have been many successful strikes—less since last spring, when the commercial slump resulted in a labor surplus. Denied the right to organize, labor in Japan uses sabotage quite successfully. On the other hand, labor is only in the elemental stages of the struggle and its political influence is insignificant.

Q. Is it true that there is no considerable Bolshevik propaganda in Japan? I use the word in its narrow sense.

- A. I think actual Bolshevism has little influence in Japan, although, of course, no country can escape the effect of what happened in Russia.
- Q. After the Russo-Japanese war one heard much about Bushido in Japan and the romantic loyalty of all classes of society to the country and the rulers. Is Bushido still strong?
- A. Yes, it is still strong, although on the whole, and especially among the working class, it is probably decaying. It must be remembered, however, that in no country is loyalty to the empire so diligently inculcated as in Japan. The origin of the imperial family is held to be divine, and the emperor's advisers have skillfully kept the imperial tradition alive. The emperor, for instance, gave millions of yen to the relief of the urban poor at the time of the rice riots, and popular wrath fell not at all upon him, but only upon the profiteers. The Japanese schools, the theater and the story tellers, the modern motion pictures, all combine in a propaganda of loyalty and the glorification of the old romantic devotion of the lower classes to the higher, and of all to the Emperor.
- Q. Is the spirit of Bushido so strong that for the sake of honor Japan would enter a war with the United States against her own economic interests?
- A. Probably not. At least at present it is not likely she would go to war about immigration, or even about China, unless America attempts to force the return of economic advantages in Shantung.
- Q. Do you think it likely that the United States will check Japan effectually in the Far East?
- A. No. The Consortium promises to bring about in China at least a considerable degree of co-operation and equitable distribution of opportunity between the larger countries' interests in China, with a corresponding decrease of the temptation for each country to go poaching. But America cannot very consistently check Japan's economic expansion in the Far East in view of American big business' own economic imperialism. Moreover, at the present time it is to the interest of American business men to lend money to the Japanese to exploit Asia rather than to enter into open competition with them for the exploitation or development of Asia. That is to say, the ambitions of Japanese merchants and financiers outrun their surplus capital. A half of the Japanese national debt is held abroad. They need to borrow from America, and on this basis an adjustment will probably be reached between the financiers of the respective nations. At any rate, at present there are many signs that American big business wants to be friendly with Japanese big business. Americans like Mr. Charles H. Sherrill, formerly in our diplomatic service, have stated rather bluntly that we will not interfere with Japan in Asia if Japanese will let the Pacific Coast of America alone.
- Q. In this game of the exploiters what chance have the Chinese and the Siberians?
- A. Not much, I am afraid—until a new spirit prevails in political and economic affairs or until they are strong enough to assert their own power.
- Q. Is not Japan short-sighted in raising the intense hatred of the Chinese? Can she not get more by gaining the moral leadership of Asia?
- A. One might think so. One cannot be dogmatic, but I am inclined to think that the attitude of imperialistic Japanese is this: "We will make the gains we want in China now even at the cost of Chinese hatred, but having entrenched ourselves securely we will cultivate Chinese friendship for all we are worth as against the white races." Whether they can succeed or not is another matter.
- Q. What do you think about the problem of Japanese immigration?
- A. I have recently been conferring with Dr. Gulick, and so far as I know the facts it seems to me that his plan partially embodied in House of Representatives Bill 14,196 is far and away the most statesmanlike. If you know his position you know mine substantially.
- Q. Is it true that Japanese must be able to emigrate because of pressure of population unless the birth rate notably declines?
- A. That is not immediately true, and in my judgment it will not be true for twenty years. After that, unless the birth rate falls, it probably will be true. But the very small emigration to Korea and the introduction of labor-saving and crop-increasing methods mean that the problem is not desperate as yet.
- Q. Is the Korean problem in your mind insoluble? Are the Koreans as firmly opposed to union with Japan as, let us say, the Irish to union with England?
- A. In my judgment they are not. Korea had real grievances against Japan, but during the past few months the Japanese have made some progress toward reform. And they have a rather creditable record for material and educational improvement in a very backward country. The tragedy of Korea is this: The strife between Japan and Russia made it inevitable that one or the other would secure possession of Korea. Japan did not dare let Russia dominate. Korea was too weak to assert her rights. If Korea could have been let alone by both Japan and Russia, although her government was corrupt and inefficient, yet under the influence of

Christianity there would have occurred a remarkable revival of the national spirit and of popular efficiency. It is a great loss to the world that imperialistic quarrels prevented the natural development of Korea. But as things stand it is a bit unfair for Occidentals to blame Japan for doing in Korea precisely what any strong power would have done. The Japanese have but followed western precedent, and they can fairly challenge comparison not only with

German records, but with French, with British in India, and certainly with American in Haiti or Santo Domingo. Japanese imperialism is reprehensible, but those who would condemn it before the court of public opinion ought to come with clean hands, and ought, by means of the League of Nations or some other arrangement, to guarantee to Japan a fair chance for economic expansion and advantageous emigration instead of crying "thief" or "don't."

What Can Religion Give Us Here?

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

I MEAN real religion, not its counterfeit; I mean average people, not saints; and I am asking, what can religion do here upon earth, this side of the grave?

Real religion, as I understand it, is not the outward practice of acts of worship or service, though it may eventuate in these; neither is it the devotion of the heart to any miscellaneous cause or object—work, socialism, etc.—but it has to do with an unseen spiritual order believed to be resident in the universe. To quote Prof. William James: "The life of religion in the broadest and most general terms possible . . . consists of the belief that there is an unseen order, and that our supreme good lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto. This belief and this adjustment are the religious attitude in the soul."* Of course no definition of religion is adequate, and anybody is at liberty to disagree with this; but in this article, whenever I use the word religion, I mean it as above.

Anyone who has studied the history of religions knows what different fruits religion has borne. Many of them have not been good. Others were so good that for the sake of them men accepted much that was bad. In this article I propose to speak mainly of fruits that are good, those which have been developed from religion in the higher stages of its evolution. It is always the part of wisdom in the examination of any subject to seek for its values more than its faults. The values which I shall set down are, to my mind, the heart of religion. Because of them religion, in spite of past alliances with frightful immoralities and many betrayals at the hands of its disciples, still lives. I group these values under four heads.

First: Religion gives us a vision to live for. It was said of old that "where there is no vision the people perish,"† and this seems to be literally true. Men individually and socially need vision. Life is wasted—frittered away or smashed in a wreck—if it has no guiding ideal.

But not every ideal will do; one that we can trust must be social, strong, and true. It must be social in the sense that it leads us to live for others more than for ourselves; and these others must be no narrow circle of one's family and a few friends, but they must come to include one's neighborhood and business associates and fellow countrymen, and in the end the human race. The ideal must be strong in that it must have power to reach down into our deepest emotions and instincts, thus releasing our subconscious energies, and enlisting for its fulfillment a psychic inheritance of power from the race. It must be strong also in its ability to win out over competing purposes and passions so that it may attain predominance and unify life in a single great allegiance. The ideal must furthermore be true; that is, it must correspond with reality, being in line at least with what is not impossible.

Now it is obvious that an ideal which is at once social, strong, and true is not altogether easy to find, but such an ideal once seen would be worth living for. We could engage our lives to it and be happy in the thought that here was a light to shine upon all the dark and perplexing places of our way. There are, of course, experiences other than religious ones which have given men such ideals; but I think that religion has produced more of these ideals and more supreme ones than anything else which can be named. One recalls the ideals of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Buddha, Jesus, Paul, John, St. Francis, and a host of others down to Tolstoi and Rauschenbusch of our own time. Is there any group of visions born apart from religion that means so much to the world in the way of social service and more life?

Or, if we look at the ideals which have come through religion to the multitude of average folk, even after these ideals have been much distorted by faults in the churches and scriptures, there has been a vision of life vouchsafed which has been as the light shining into the darkness and the darkness comprehending it not. How many women suffer-

*Varieties of Religious Experience," page 48.
†Proverbs, Chapter 29, Verse 18.

ing grievous pain, how many men carrying intolerable loads, how many young people at the moment of some strong decision or bitter renunciation, have through religion come to some insight of meaning, some vision of purpose or destiny, which has been for them the light of their lives, the way out of the midnight into the morning!

"What empire," writes Saint Teresa, "is comparable to that of a soul who, from this sublime summit to which God has raised her, sees all the things of earth beneath her feet, and is captivated by no one of them?"*

Second: Religion offers a profound partnership with power. Professor W. E. Hocking, to whom I am indebted for much that follows in this section, has called attention to "the multiplication of human power by association" and to the part which association often plays in changing the character of pain.† Campers who have gone off on arduous trips, parents who have together faced pain, conscientious objectors who have suffered in prison in groups, know how the brute fact of pain can take on a certain glory when it is met in company with at least one other comrade. "That pain," says Professor Hocking, "which is taken in common, like effort which is carried on in common, is found through the association to lose its harshness . . . and the general condition for the transmuting of hardship seems to be this: that the sense of *union with something not myself*, which I judge worthy of this very hardship, and which somehow demands it for adequate expression, shall be dense and compacted in the moments of suffering."

Now religion, which offers us association with the "Unseen Order," with God, fulfills these requirements in a supreme way. For whenever we conceive of God as Substance, Energy, Law, or Person—and all the great religions have thought of God in one or more of these ways—there is for the religious person in the experience of worship a "sense of *union with something not myself*" which is felt to be worthy of any hardship and to be above it and glad to match strength with it; and this consciousness is by the thrill of religious emotion stamped deep in the mind, "dense and compacted." It is there for "the moments of suffering" and may also be drawn upon for the long and dull routines of ordinary life. It is felt to be an incredible enhancement of value, and to expand the reach of life infinitely since it touches what is Universal. This association of the consciousness with God is also a more certain pain-transforming power than is the association with human friends. They may prove weak or turn false or die or go away. Then we lose *what we had counted on* to help us bear such losses as might come. But when our partnership is with

the Divine we feel unshakably secure. And especially if we can think of God in personal terms, as Jesus did when He spoke of Him as Father, then it is possible to realize God as an intimate, always present, infallible associate; and thus there is set up the deepest partnership with power men can know.

No one, it is true, understands the exact strength or limits of this Power. Up to a certain point it can apparently be used for evil, as can electricity or love or any other natural force. War, bigotry, and persecution have gotten power through religion. But on the whole religious power has shown itself more congenial to causes which are good; and certainly it can be utilized for them. This power is seen to operate according to natural law. It apparently has some limitations, not being almighty in the absolute sense of that term. And yet it is a power which is felt by those in partnership with it to be ever sufficient for all the exigencies of life. Time, fate, sorrow, fear and death are believed to be conquerable by it. Whether or not they can be really or always so conquered is a question not fully answerable this side of death. Subjectively, we may believe it; objectively, we can know that many human persons, not ourselves, have in fact met the vicissitudes of life triumphantly, most of them testifying that they did so through religion; and up to the extreme edge of death their spirits were victorious and they had no fear. It is natural to believe that what they did we can do if we also enter the partnership which religion at its best can give.

Third: Religion makes possible a glad way of life among men. The plight of human beings struggling at the same time for fellowship and freedom was once likened by Schopenhauer to a group of porcupines continually huddling together for warmth, but as often drawing apart because each felt himself stuck by his neighbor's quills. It is a suggestive picture of the underlying problem of all social life. In the past, attempts to solve it have been mainly in the direction of coercion or else along the opposite road of unlimited individualistic freedom. Only now and again at rare intervals have there been prophets of humanity who seemed to see the true way out of the dilemma. One such was Jesus of Nazareth, and I turn now to His teaching, condensing what I believe its substance was:

Every person is a child of God, and as such has absolute worth. Even the lowest, the most evil, is a creature with a soul; that is, he has in him the capacity for growth to the Divine. Everyone can be a living temple for God's Spirit. Everyone has a special individuality which is valuable to God; and if anything is done to hurt or destroy that individuality, there is an offense not only against the person involved, but directly against God.

It therefore follows that in the relations of men one with another freedom for personality should be

*Quoted in "Varieties of Religious Experience."

†W. E. Hocking, "The Meaning of God in Human Experience," New Haven, 1912, page 222.

scrupulously safeguarded. Any coercive use of one person by another as his tool, any exploitation of one class by another, is totally wrong and is sin against the Universe. Soon or late such conduct always results in suffering. Its natural end is destruction, and no social order built upon it can last. Therefore it behooves men to repent, to turn away from these fundamental errors of all past social constructions, and to build in their place a new society, the Kingdom of God, which should first of all show reverence for personality and allow freedom for growth to everybody, even the outcast.

But all who have this freedom need further to develop their persons and to save their society, by love. For it is in the service of love alone that perfect freedom can be found, and it is through the cohesion of love that there can be a society which will not gall. These deep truths seem to have been in the consciousness of Jesus, when, on the night of His betrayal, being at supper with the disciples whom He loved, "knowing that He had come from God and was going to God, He rose from table, laid aside His robe, and tied a towel round Him, then poured water into a basin, and began to wash the feet of the disciples, wiping them with the towel he had tied round him."* His teaching at the conclusion was: "I have been setting you an example, that you should do what I have done to you . . . blessed are you if you really do it."

This voluntary service in love was in the eyes of Jesus the mightiest force that could be employed against evil. It reached its supreme and loftiest expression in acts of love towards enemies. It was not impractical but wise, and a course of action which could be relied on to hold good no matter what might occur. It corresponded with the deepest reality of the universe and was the surest way to partnership with Supreme Power. Professor Hocking puts it in these words:

"From the beginning of religious thought, in the very conception of a creator, there has been present to the mind of man a Being who is present alike in good and evil. In quite ancient times, as times go, we find a wholly explicit definition of such a Being as the desire of all mankind. The founder of a popular religion held up to the minds of a spell-bound multitude as his own original revelation a God who 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.' Upon this basis he defined the 'perfection' of God, and summoned men to the same perfection, the same absolute bearing. Thereby he defined an attitude of equal treatment toward friend and enemy, toward good and bad,—an attitude much garbled and misunderstood, but an attitude wholly intelligible in the light of that unmistakable description of the Absolute God."†

It is this absolute attitude in human conduct, sprung from religion and sustained by living partnership with it, that makes glad the experience of life among "porcupine" men. Only those who have tried it fully know, but they are sure. To them it is the secret of social existence and the one promising path to freedom and fellowship for all.

Fourth: Religion produces an immediate experience of good. The testimony of the scientific psychologists who have studied the data of autobiographic religious experience is practically unanimous on this point—James, Starbuck, Coe, Leuba, Hocking and others are agreed that the awakening of religious consciousness results at its climax in a feeling of deep and immediate joy. They cite innumerable examples, one of which must here suffice:

"In an instant the Lord made me so happy that I cannot express what I felt. I remember this, that everything looked new to me, the people, the fields, the cattle, the trees; I was like a new man in a new world."‡

"Religion," writes James, "ought to mean nothing short of this new reach of freedom for us, with the struggle over, the keynote of the universe sounding in our ears, and everlasting possession spread before our eyes."§ Similarly Hocking speaks of "faith" as the "present possession of the distant sources of worth and certainty."‡

In writing of the distinction between religion and the Arts he continues: "Art is long; religion is immediate. The attainment in every Art is future, infinitely distant; the attainment of religion is present. . . . Knowledge, for example, is an infinite quest in the order of nature—and in it there is no absolute certainty but only a growing probability and approximation; but the religious soul knows now." It is the same, he points out, with human brotherhood and morality; and he then generalizes: "Religion . . . is the present attainment in a single experience of those objects which in the course of nature are reached only at the end of infinite progression. Religion is anticipated attainment."

With many persons this takes the sense of an "enveloping friendliness" on the part of God. Thus writes one: "It is the experience of myriads of trustful souls that this sense of God's unflinching presence with them in their going out and in their coming in, and by night and day, is a source of absolute repose and confident calmness. It drives away all fear of what may befall them."§ Magnificently expressed is the same experience in the words of Tolstoi: "A religious man . . . knows that besides life and death, nothing can happen, and that life and death are in the hands of God."¶

*H. G. Wells, "Mr. Britling Sees It Through," page 420.
 †Quoted in "Varieties of Religious Experience," page 249.
 ‡The Meaning of God in Human Experience, page 31.
 §Quoted in "Varieties of Religious Experience," page 275.
 ¶Quoted in John Haynes Holmes's "Readings From Great Authors," page 77.

*Gospel of John, Chapter 13, Verse 3, and following—Met-fair's translation.
 †The Meaning of God in Human Experience, page 205.

In conclusion, there remains for me only to add a word of reminder that the gifts of religion of which I have written are not a matter of theoretical probability, but a common and actual experience to greater or less degree of innumerable people. Many of them did indeed at one time know about religion only as a theory, an item of dubious information; but there came a day when this was changed and an experience overtook them which was valid and vital for the rest of their lives. Representative of this is H. G. Well's description of the religious awakening of Mr. Britling:

"Hitherto God had been for him a thing of the intelligence, a theory, a report, something told about but not realized . . . Mr. Britling's thinking about God hitherto had been like someone who has found an empty house, very beautiful and pleasant, full of the promise of a fine personality. And then as the discoverer makes his lonely, curious explorations, he hears downstairs, dear and friendly, the voice of the Master coming in. . . .

"I have thought too much of myself," said Mr. Britling, 'and of what I would do by myself. I have forgotten that which was with me.'"

Corners

By ZEPHINE HUMPHREY

WAS there ever a time when corners were dearer? I do not mean corner lots, nor has my adjective anything to do with the H. C. of L. which usurps and monopolizes so many meanings now-a-days that all conversational references tend to flow into it. In fact the dear corners which I have in mind are precisely the agencies best calculated to resist the encroachments of the common tyrant; and their success in stealing the enemy's slogan and using it for a baatiude is a triumph indeed. Dear because relatively cheap: victorious paradox!

All sorts of people who once frequented arenas are lurking in corners now, and—perhaps to their surprise—are living more deeply and fully there than in their old central haunts.

That may be largely the universal effect of the war. Everyone, everywhere, is living more deeply than six years ago. But the world's arena is so confused, so noisy with cry and counter-cry, claim and counter-claim, so disappointing in its reaction from high, disinterested purpose, that even those self-possessed souls best qualified by nature to keep their wits about them must often lose their sense of direction in the general dust and clamor.

Sometimes one is tempted to wish that the Lord would send a great broom and sweep the arena clear, scattering all its occupants into corners and keeping them there until they had fully made up their minds what they want and intend to do next, what is best for them all. Would any reconstructive cause be the loser for the respite of silence which would ensue? At least the immediate welfare of the world would not suffer, for food is its primal necessity now and people in corners usually have gardens.

Well, doubtless, the Lord knows His own weapons best, and of course the aforementioned H. C. of L. is a sort of broom. It has swept sundry ex-arena folk into the corner which I inhabit, and though all the prevailing shades of opinion are represented among us (the war ended too soon, it

did not end soon enough, it ought never to have happened at all, it was a noble crusade, the Peace of Versailles was a disgraceful crime, the Peace of Versailles was a model of justice), we get along very harmoniously together, being, for the most part, too busy even to argue much.

That being so, we feel justified in obeying our extreme disinclination to meddle with it. (Those of us who were in France during the war did enough meddling for a lifetime!) Also we feel justified in accepting the new peace and contentment which our corner gives us; for though peace and contentment are boons not to be taken lightly in the face of world misery, the fact that they have their source in limitation rather than in expansion robs them of offensiveness. Moreover, of course, the joy which comes from doing without has for part of its significance the ability to share a surplus with others. Yet again, it is not only our frugal material comfort which we ask nothing better than to share, but the thing which has given it to us, the corner idea. There are corners everywhere. Hardly a person, certainly not a nation or government, need be at a loss for a means to retrench and retire, to recollect, to get down to fundamentals and be still awhile. A bare living is easily raised, still more easily shared; and if one apprehends it aright, a bare living is nectar and ambrosia. Saint Francis found it so, and a few years ago we were all enthusiastically professing a Franciscan cult. The H. C. of L. gives us a magnificent chance to prove our sincerity.

But were we, are we sincere? Alas! that is the question that makes its way even into dear corners and stings and torments. There are several pacifists in our corner, and they cannot escape the new habit of challenge which the war has bred in them. The Christian Church—how can it mean both its recently reiterated summonses: "In the name of Christ, go forth and slay, use poison gas and bombs, consolidate blockades;" "In the name of Christ, resist not evil but overcome evil with good"? The

staggering question is another broom the Lord has sent to sweep us apart and set us pondering.

Probably all people would agree—friends and enemies alike—that a corner is the place of places for a pacifist! The enemy's reason is obvious; that of the friend is more subtle, consisting in the proved conviction that outspoken pacifist arguments do more harm than good, serving mostly to infuriate, whereas pacifist prayers—well, at least, prayer infuriates no one, and it is a weapon the wielding of which lies in the hand of God.

But the pacifist shadow (one of the great, lonely tragedies of the war) must not be allowed to darken my present theme. For a corner's chief business is that of healing, reassuring, and encouraging. The pacifists in our corner are as happy as they can ever be anywhere again, and the faith they have lost in their church and their world comes flowing to help them when they lift up their eyes unto their hills and when they concern themselves with the simple, homely affairs of their neighborhood.

Simple: is not the very word healing? Does it not lift an immense burden of perplexity and effort? We have tried so hard all our lives, and our whole civilization has been so intricate and elaborate. And what has it amounted to? If statesmen and reformers incline to scoff at a corner philosophy, elevating their shoulders and eyebrows slightly (it is a trick we have brought home from France), smiling in their worldly wisdom and saying, "The way is not so easy as that," we of the corner may surely retaliate, "But neither, apparently, is it so hard as you make it, since, with all your complicated exertions, you have not succeeded in establishing it."

The way: what way? There was One, nearly two thousand years ago, who said, "I am the Way," and defining the matter further, explained, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Perhaps when every conceivable plan under heaven (well under it, many of them!) is being suggested for the world's reconstruction, it might not come amiss to try living like little children awhile, walking humbly with our God. Now God is in the arena, of course; He has to be, if only to make things lively for the devil. But, from the beginning of history, it has been in corners that men have instinctively sought Him; and in order to know Him, they have felt the necessity of being still. "Be still and know that I am God"; that is a corner precept.

But what would become of the railroad problem if we all retired to corners? And how should we manage our presidential campaign? And who would revive and revise the Treaty of Peace? And the Inter-Church movement? And the college endowment campaigns? And—and—and!

Well, frankly and honestly now, what of all those urgent affairs unless the spirit of Christ be in them,

unless they surely conduce to love and brotherhood? We dare not trust them, that is the trouble. The disillusionments of the last six years have shaken our faith. None of them—not even the Inter-Church Movement, not even the Church League for Industrial Democracy—starts out with the humble confession of sin which would disarm and convince. We in corners have grown wary. Tell us first what you are going to preach in your churches and teach in your colleges and what you are going to embody in your new Treaty of Peace.

People in corners devote much thought to their fellows in other corners. When the feet are established in silence, the imagination ranges. As I move about my kitchen, preparing the utterly simple meals which seem so delicious to us and, through the window, watching Christopher at work in the garden, I wonder about other women in other kitchens and other men in other gardens. What are they thinking about? What kind of judgment are they passing on the revelations of their daily papers? They are an increasing multitude (the broom of the Lord sweeps steadily), and though they have little to say for themselves, it may be that the weight of their silent opinion will some day make itself felt. Then perhaps simplicity will come sweetly into its own, and we shall perceive that, without knowing it, we have become a nation of little children in corners and there is at last some real hope for us.

In Memoriam

NO word of ours can express the tribute all lovers of liberty and high courage would offer to Lord Mayor MacSwiney and his fellow hunger strikers as well as AE's beautiful poem, which we reprint from the *London Times*. Profoundly do we hope that among the British people such heroism will awaken a response which will avert the incalculable consequences of a continuance of Lloyd George's monstrous policy of repression.

BRIXTON PRISON—BY AE

See, though the oil be low, more purely still and higher

The flame burns in the body's lamp! The watchers still

Gaze with unseeing eyes while the Promethean will,
The uncreated Light, the Everlasting Fire,
Sustains itself against the torturers' desire
Even as the fabled Titan chained upon the hill.
Burn on, shine here, thou immortality, until
We too have lit our lamps at the funeral pyre;
Till we too can be noble, unshakable, undismayed:
Till we too can burn with the holy flame and know
There is that within us can triumph over pain,
And go to death alone, slowly and unafraid.
The candles of God are already burning, row on row,

Farewell, light-bringer, fly to thy heaven again.

Watch the Denver Churches

A Significant Aftermath of the Denver Car Strike

By G. S. LACKLAND

CONSERVATIVES in Denver rubbed their eyes on the morning of September 4th to find in their morning paper the statement, "Methodists Denounce Open Shop." The resolution introduced by the Social Service Commission stated that "We cannot favor any interpretation of the 'open shop' policy which would deny to labor the right to organize or to bargain collectively." It passed by a vote of one hundred to three!

The tramway strike commenced August 1st. The union had notified the Industrial Commission thirty days previously of their demands, offered to arbitrate, and requested a conference with the Tramway Company. Boiled down, there were two fundamental demands: a union contract and an increase from fifty-eight cents to seventy-five cents an hour. The company refused to consider the requests and did not grant a conference until the twenty-eighth day. Meanwhile, the officials had employed the Jerome strike-breaking agency of San Francisco, screened its cars, and transformed its car barns into arsenals. This naturally aroused the employees and the strike vote resulted.

On August 5th cars ran with armed strikebreakers in charge under police protection. The union officials pleaded for the disarmament of strike breakers, but in vain.

Two cars were sent out at 5.30 p. m. while a crowd of two thousand men, mostly from railway crowd of two thousand men, mostly from railway and some hot-heads started to throw stones and the strike breakers fired into the crowd. Pandemonium broke loose, the cars were destroyed, and the strike breakers and many bystanders were badly injured. Within four hours a mob beyond control of the police had overturned four more street cars, wrecked the *Denver Post* building, and attempted to set fire to the South Side car barns.

The next morning over one thousand special police were sworn in and the American Legion aided in patrolling the city. At night Jerome's men fired into a crowd at the East Side barns and over fifty casualties resulted.

Martial law was then declared, and federal troops were welcomed by all classes.

A group of churchmen headed by James H. Caussey, a layman, and Dr. O. W. Auman, District Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church, called a meeting of all ministers to consider what attitude the Church should take. All denominations, including Catholics and Jews, were present. A commission of nine was elected to ascertain the

facts concerning the strike. This commission requested that the Federated Council of Churches in Christ and the Catholic Social Welfare Council aid in the investigation. The former selected Dr. E. T. Devine, while the latter sent Dr. Lapp and Father John Ryan. Over four weeks were spent in the investigation. The results will soon be published.

This investigation is fraught with significance. It is the first time that Catholics, Jews and Protestants have cooperated in matters of social welfare. It is the first time that a group of local churches have taken united action in an industrial crisis. Only one protest was filed and that was by the Central Presbyterian Church—a rich, aristocratic organization whose session is confessedly conservative.

It is the purpose of the Denver churches to use the investigation as a guide to action in future industrial crises. The strike is a perfect illustration of the limits to which advocates of the "open shop" are prepared to go. Over one hundred persons have been injured through shootings and the inefficiency of strike-breaking motormen. The Tramway Company stated during the second week that the strike had cost the company over \$400,000. Inasmuch as they were on the verge of bankruptcy before the strike, it is of interest to know who is furnishing the war funds.

The attitude of the press was most markedly inflammatory. "Black Jack" Jerome and his strike breakers were played up for four days preceding the riots in all daily papers as heroes. The strikers were viciously misrepresented. One paper advocated "Give them lead."

Another interesting side is the fact that an overwhelming number of strikers were native-born Americans. Over two hundred were ex-service men.

In spite of overwhelming testimony that Jerome's men had fired into an innocent crowd and wounded over fifty, including many women and children, a grand jury composed of nine business men and three working men did not return a single indictment against the strike breakers or company officials, but three labor leaders were among those indicted. By the use of injunction the seven members of the Executive Board of the Tramway Union were ruled in contempt of court and sent to jail. This in spite of the fact that the men agreed to abandon all demands and return to work in a body on the basis of the *status quo*.

The City of Denver is divided into two hostile camps. The workers have affiliated with the Non-

partisan League and have captured ninety per cent. of the Democratic nominations in the recent primary.

The Church cannot remain neutral. It must know the facts and in their light boldly demand that jus-

tice be administered and that human welfare supersede the cold-blooded demand for dividends manifested by the business world. Will the churches of the West fail? Upon that answer may depend the future of the Christian Church in America.

Why We Do Not Support the League

MR. EDWARD M. WINSTON'S able letter in support of the League of Nations, which we print elsewhere in this issue, prompts us to restate our position. The first thing to be said is that the present "solemn referendum" on that subject is, to our mind, largely unreal. The agitation against the League is already so strong that even if Cox were elected, he neither could nor would secure the ratification of the treaty without reservations, which would make it plain that the United States was not signing a blank check to underwrite the imperialistic intrigues of European diplomats. Fortunately it is perfectly clear that a Democratic victory could not possibly secure the adoption of the treaty without a clear statement that Article X does not morally bind us to go to war to enforce the iniquitous arrangements made at Versailles. On the other hand, if Mr. Harding is elected, we are inclined to agree with those who think that in the battle for possession of his mind Messrs. Root, Wickersham and Taft are likely to win over Messrs. Borah and Johnson. Despite Mr. Harding's condemnation of the League, we venture to predict that his "association" will prove quite similar to Cox's League. Whether Cox or Harding is elected our relations to the European powers will be determined not by politicians' words, but by the realities of the interrelation between European conditions and American interests.

This statement does not, however, dispose of the argument advanced not only by our own correspondent but by Mr. Raymond Fosdick in the October *Atlantic Monthly* to the effect that liberals have more to gain from trying to use the League than from denouncing it. Mr. Fosdick, for example, frankly admits the iniquities of the present treaty, but he says it is now too late to change that treaty by any new peace conference. He argues that the best to be hoped is that the League may be used to liberalize both the peace of Versailles and all such new international arrangements as may be made hereafter. It is quite true that no new peace conference held in the present temper of the world would very much improve the peace of Versailles. The golden opportunity to make an enduring peace was lost. It will not soon return. For that lost opportunity Republicans are as guilty as Democrats. It was not the perfidy of the Treaty of Versailles, with its repudiation of the fourteen points on which

the armistice was based, but its alleged internationalism which provoked most of the opposition in the United States Senate. So long as the present congeries of passion, prejudiced nationalism, and economic self-interest which constitutes capitalistic imperialism prevails in all the victorious countries, genuine internationalism is an idle dream. The only question is whether the League of Nations affords machinery for making effective a new spirit of reconciliation. This we doubt. Only in reference to its possible effect on Japan do we think the advocates of the League make a strong case, and any probable benefit in connection with Japanese affairs is outweighed by other considerations. The constitution of the League is cleverly arranged so that if it lives and does not die it will remain predominantly in the possession of the financiers and the secret diplomats and the militarists of the five victorious powers who absolutely control the council. The League may be allowed by its masters to settle little quarrels, and to do some useful work in sanitation, etc. Even before the war these things were done through the Hague court and other machinery. But those whom the peoples of Central Europe call the "Hunger Lords" were quite too clever to plan a League which would easily pass under liberal control. Rather, the machinery they devised, if it is to be effective at all, is certain to work against those forces which would establish a new economic order. The Russian Revolution was the acid test. The League utterly failed to meet it. *De facto* recognition of Soviet Russia would have done more for the present and the future peace of the world than any League.

The worst feature of the League controversy is the fact that the fair appearance of the League so easily misleads men of high character to give it support instead of facing the reality that only a spiritual and economic revolution will save mankind and make possible a genuine association of free peoples. To effect that revolution without chaos and widespread civil war is so hard a task as to require the energy of all men of intelligence and good will. We have passed the time, if ever we had reached it, when we can be saved by any treaty or by any form of international machinery which does not cut into the heart of our present social order. There is no easy way of salvation, but only the difficult task of the creation of an economic and social

order in which it is no longer to the immense profit of imperialists to exploit the earth, its resources, and its inhabitants. The wars that still curse Central Europe and the Near East show how impotent or worse is the machinery of the League of Nations for effecting this end. They deceive themselves who hope against hope. League or no League, a continuance of capitalist imperialism will within a

generation lead to a new world war incomparably more terrible than the one we have survived. Even now the storm clouds are beginning to gather. In the face of these facts it will be a genuine tragedy if idealists continue to believe they can heal the world's wounds with so deceitful a panacea as the League of the imperialists embodied in the Carthaginian peace of Versailles.

Spiritual Resources in the Cooperative Movement

By ARTHUR WALLACE CALHOUN

THE life of the spirit is a life of fellowship. There is in it no room for aloofness, conceit, or other manifestation of self-seeking. Real spirituality develops as the inner essence of comradeship and can arise by no other means. Judged from this higher standpoint, the experiences and resources of life are of value in proportion as they contribute to the growth of real sociality, to the spread of the disposition to mutuality and democratic good-will. To the person that approaches from this point of view the discordant movements of social radicalism there often comes a bitter sense of disillusionment, a feeling that much of the movement of revolt is expressive of egoism, conceit, "smartness," "freshness," and even less admirable traits, and that the spirit of commonwealth has scarcely begun to develop, even within the ranks of those that sacrifice most for the advocacy of its forms. In so far as this sad judgment holds, there can be no doubt that the revolutionary movement is little better than an empty shell. A right social order may be expected to develop, in the course of time, the right spirit among the populace, but a right social order does not get going under an impetus of mere cynicism and egotism; and even when the revolution has occurred, the new institutions will develop the new character, not automatically, but only through positive efforts of a cultural sort to mediate between the material forms and the souls of the multitudes.

The coercive disposition which is at present uppermost among the outstanding revolutionaries is admittedly not an organ of fellowship. At best, it is bound to engender new animosities that will have to be lived down. At worst, it threatens to impose a continuance of despotism, based no longer, perhaps, on the private ownership of property, but rather on the instinct of self-assertion and the essentially aristocratic principle of "superior brains." The survival of the democratic ideal may indeed be contingent on the discovery of new sources and channels of good-will that can rein-

force the battle for commonwealth, repudiate any compromise with the powers of prey, and at the same time assist in the building up of an inclusive community spirit that will vitalize the institutions of the new order. Those that propose to measure institutions and life by spiritual standards must be on the lookout for elements in the present chaotic muddle that are capable of being brought together into a stream of intrinsic comradeship before which divisive and malevolent interests and influences will not be able to stand.

The cooperative movement is rather broader in its basis and outlook than are most other expressions of the revolutionary spirit. While distinctly a proletarian movement committed to a world-wide cooperative commonwealth, its method is not such as to invite the mistrust or ill-will of any honest-hearted member of any social class; nor can the most confirmed "individualist" object to what the movement aims to accomplish, inasmuch as it is purely voluntaristic and rests its case on the superiority of cooperation as an instrument of triumph in the very battle of competition itself. The cooperative commonwealth which it contemplates is not cast in the mold of "statism," or "syndicalism," or "dictatorship." On the other hand, it is not to be an incoherent nightmare, or even a perpetuation of the chaos of the present so-called "economic system" (which is neither systematic nor economic). A cooperative system such as that which includes a third of the population of Great Britain demonstrates the entire feasibility of a flexible and at the same time a coherent and unitary organization of industry on a purely voluntaristic basis. Such a prevision of the commonwealth holds out possibilities of efficiency, progress, and power, without danger to the personality of the citizen and with no flavor of "coming slavery."

This cooperative movement hinges on personality rather than on investment, on comradeship rather than on financial power, on the worthwhileness of social achievement rather than on the quest of in-

dividual material gain. While it is true that the movement does not yet realize its spiritual potentialities, there are not wanting signs of latent power along communal lines. Many a man has put his whole life into Cooperation without thought of personal advantage and at a salary not at all commensurate with capitalist estimates of his grade of ability. Many local groups have found in the ways of comradeship a joy and a satisfaction in the free expression of social and cultural interests that no amount of philanthropic benevolence could possibly engender. The political movement of the working-class and the industrial movement of the working-class would do well to take into account the constructive value of a fellowship based on material interests but lifting its head into the highest reaches of spiritual power.

It is equally important that the cooperative movement itself be made self-conscious as to its latent spirit and life. There are undoubtedly far more members than cooperators, far more seekers of material gain than of spiritual worth. It must be the immediate function of Cooperation, as a branch of the revolutionary drive, to keep to the front the value of voluntary association and the indispensable service of a movement that is developing a body of proletarian executives, an organization of proletarian industry and business, and a mass of proletarian cooperators with prolonged experience in the actual operation of economic concerns, not to speak of the moral enthusiasm associated with the material success. But within the ranks of the cooperators there is urgent need of broader enlightenment, keener discipline, and higher culture, all designed to liberate the forces of comradeship now largely obscured and repressed by the rush of affairs and the weight of the profit system. Persons with the higher vision, the broader sympathies, the zest for fellowship can, if they are of the proletarian mind, find even now openings in the cooperative movement that will put them in line for work of the most constructive and idealistic type.

A new education for Cooperation is developing. The European movements are establishing colleges and universities for technical and cultural training in line with the tendencies and needs of the movement. In this country the same work is under way on a growing scale, and it is but a question of time till full facilities are available for the soundest and broadest training of leaders and members—a training that will not only enrich the movement from within, but will find a way into it for many earnest men and women unable to reconcile themselves longer to the humiliating conditions of employment offered by the capitalist system. An increasing number of us may even now find a way to lead a comradely life and to govern our major activities by the spirit of the commonwealth.

German Refugees from Alsace-Lorraine

MUCH has been written regarding the treatment which French and Belgian civilians received at the hands of the German military authorities, but very little has been said of the treatment of Germans in Alsace-Lorraine now that it has become French territory.

About a year ago, without warning, the expulsion of Germans from Alsace-Lorraine began; the first groups were dispatched like prisoners, nor were they allowed to take anything with them. Later on a few hours' warning was given and they were permitted to carry about seventy-five pounds of personal effects; but the strong were not allowed to carry things for the weak, nor were parents allowed to carry even for their own children. Property could be realized on by what amounted to "forced sale," and friends left behind could send on the proceeds. These "forced sales" usually failed to realize more than a small proportion of the actual value of the property.

The condition of refugees was often desperate. They were crowded in the then over-crowded city of Frankfurt, and were housed in small rooms, sometimes as many as twelve or thirteen in a room. They were without clothing, without food, without the means of earning money with which to buy clothing or food. In all there were over 120,000 expelled from their former homes. The whole scene resembled conditions that prevailed among the French who were driven from the same territory after the war of 1870.

Frankfurt became the center for distribution of these refugees. Groups were sent to settle in various places all over Germany. Near Frankfurt is a tract of 2,800 acres of good farm land, which in 1912 was bought up by the German government as a military training ground. The barracks have been empty since the war. The German Government turned this property over to the refugees. At first forty families accepted the opportunity to make their homes here and settled near the Hamlet Bad Orb. The families were united into a community to which the government transfers the land and the houses—thus the community becomes a little experiment in communism with all work done for the common benefit.

Because of the poverty of these refugees they were unable to secure the necessary farm implements, seeds, and stock with which to start their farms. Members of the Society of Friends in London made a grant of about \$5,800 for the purchase of horses, cattle, and agricultural implements. At present these are to be loaned to the community, which later on will buy them. Representatives of the Service Committee are stationed in the community and are rendering all the help possible in order that a new start in life may be made.

A Letter to Protestant Ministers

THE WORLD TOMORROW has tried to give reasons for its faith in Irish freedom. We have secured an unusually competent correspondent with no Irish affiliations to investigate the situation. We have published her letters. We have also published the solemn declaration of the *London Nation* that no conceivable government in Ireland could be as bad as Dublin Castle rule. It is our own conviction that no atrocity is so serious as the continuing atrocity of the attempt by coercion laws and the sacking of cities to govern a proud people against their will. From the deliberate attempt to coerce Ireland spring all the other ills of the situation.

Many of you, however, are not persuaded by the evidence we have carried. It is not our present purpose to argue the problem as a whole, but simply to point out one especial responsibility that rests upon you. The Catholics in certain Ulster towns have suffered from veritable pogroms at a time when not a hair on the heads of the isolated Protestants in Southern Ireland has been touched. On this subject American Protestants ought to speak in unmistakable tones. A Protestant delegation from Ulster received hospitable welcome from many Protestant churches. The delegation has diligently advertised the fact in Ulster. Let American Protestants at least make it plain that their welcome gave no blanket endorsement of a revival of religious warfare. The tragic facts about the Ulster riots are inescapable and undeniable. Last month we quoted the *Nation's* comment on them. Mr. Francis Hackett in a tone far removed from religious bigotry comments on the situation as he studied it in Belfast. This is his summary: "In the name of law and order 4,000 workmen are evicted, burned out, driven away. Hundreds of people are wounded and over two score killed." So far as we are aware, there has been no attempt to deny the fact that in the serious Ulster rioting Protestants and Unionists were the aggressors, Catholics and Sinn Feiners the sufferers and the defenders. On the whole, the military supported the rioters, who burned homes and attacked women and children in the name of loyalty to the British empire and to Protestant religion. A vivid picture of events is to be found in certain private letters which have been sent us. They depict people who for days "were in hourly dread of a raid," who "for nights had no sleep," and whose anxiety has not yet been relieved. This is true of those who did not themselves suffer dispossession or physical injury. It is to the everlasting credit of the Catholics that so far as we can discover they have expressed so little hate in reply. One letter we have seen, having recounted events, ends thus: "There are hun-

dreds of refugees in Belfast; homeless and penniless and no prospect of getting work, we don't even realize what some of our people are suffering. I hope you won't forget to say a prayer for us all; that's the best you can do for the present." There is no word of hate. Irish papers report Protestant meetings in South Ireland to protest against the conduct of their co-religionists. Here and there an attempt is made to extenuate these pogroms, as well as the abominable deeds of the "black and tans," by reference to the shooting of policemen. However severely you may condemn these acts, surely you will agree that it is monstrous to argue that the murder of policeman charged with particular crimes against the Irish people justifies the pogroms in Ulster or the sack of Irish towns. Surely you do not believe that sniping in Belgium justified the sacking of Louvain or that the revolutionary terrorism under the Tsar justified Jewish pogroms. Moreover, the English Quaker commission calls attention to the fact that "safety is found only in those districts from which the English military police have been withdrawn"—a fact which points an easy way to real law and order.

The Sinn Fein leaders as a rule recognize that the motive behind this revival of religious warfare is primarily economic and secondarily political. Belfast employers find it easier to deal with labor divided on the religious issue. The riots began with the ejection of Catholic workmen from the shipyards, where, owing to slack time, there is a fierce competition for jobs. But the truth is that the employers and the politicians of the type of Sir Edward Carson have created a monster they cannot control. They have lit fires of bigotry that burn brighter than one could have believed possible in this century. They have encouraged the doctrine that the Protestant Ulsterman belongs to a chosen people and can guide his conduct by the ethics of the Book of Joshua. No more un-Christian doctrine is conceivable. Ulstermen are too fine, have too creditable contribution to make to Irish life, to fall prey to a continuance of this delusion. Whatever American Protestants believe as to the ultimate solution of the Irish problem, let them by word and deed make it plain that all Protestantism is disgraced by the Belfast pogroms. We dare not forget that a continuance of Irish atrocities endangers the peace of the world.

NORMAN THOMAS.

IT is with sorrow that we have learned of the death of Ralph B. Colson. A contributor to this magazine, Mr. Colson was Associate Executive Secretary of the Wu-han Y. M. C. A., and did much for the cause of understanding and good will between China and the United States.

Misunderstanding Guild Socialism

By NORMAN EWER

THERE can be no question that some of the most constructive thinking and writing in the English language is being done by the so-called Guildsmen of whom G. D. H. Cole, S. G. Hobson, Arthur Penly and A. R. Orage are perhaps the best known. So great is the suggestivity of the Guild Socialist program that from time to time THE WORLD TOMORROW hopes to publish articles upon it. We are happy to present Mr. Ewer's as the first. Unfortunately, as Mr. Ewer points out in his article, the name "Guild Socialists" has gained wide currency among those who do not understand its real meaning. Perhaps, therefore, it may be pertinent to attempt a sort of preliminary and general definition of Guild Socialism.

The Guildsman, in common with all socialists, looks for the abolition of private control of capital and the wage system. Industry, he believes, should be controlled by cooperative associations of the workers in their own association or guild, and the inter-relations of industries should be administered by a National Guild. So far the plan resembles syndicalism, but the Guildsmen differ from the syndicalists in that they would still maintain the State as representing the interests of men as consumers. The State, for instance, would have charge of problems of sanitation, education, and the like. This division is based upon existing distinctions between the interests of men and women as producers and as consumers, as workers and as citizens. As a steel worker, for instance, a man is naturally tremendously interested in the control of the industry in which he gains his livelihood; and his natural comrades are his fellow steel workers, in whatever part of the country they may be. But as a resident, let us say of Homestead, Pa., a man is or ought to be interested in making Homestead a clean, decent, and beautiful town, and his natural comrades are his fellow residents. The Guildsmen are not altogether clear as to the exact relations between the State and the National Guild; but in general they would all justify the existence of dual authority as making for liberty and avoiding the danger that exists in an all-powerful sovereign State which too easily assumes metaphysical sanctions.

In subsequent issues we hope to deal further with this matter either through articles or through book reviews, calling attention not only to the strength but to the unsolved problems in the Guild theory.

THE EDITORS.

IN England "Guild Socialism" is very much "in the air" just now. You can't discuss any vital economic question for five minutes without bumping up against it. Everybody talks about it.

Society ladies who profess intelligent interest in politics will ask you to "tell them all about these guilds." Even Mr. Lloyd George has views on the subject: of course he has his facts all wrong; but he has heard about Guild Socialism. And if you know Mr. Lloyd George, you will realize what a lot that means.

Since so much is being talked about the subject, it follows, of course, that a large percentage of what is talked is the merest nonsense: that half—or more than half—of the good folk that chatter about National Guilds haven't any idea—or have entirely erroneous ideas—of what Guild Socialists mean by the term.

Now for the most part that doesn't matter—very much. But there is one particular form of misunderstanding (or of misrepresentation) that *does* matter. And I got the impression when I was in New York last autumn that it was a form of misunderstanding that had crossed the Atlantic, and was misleading people on your side about the aims and ideals of Guild Socialists here.

The idea has got abroad—has, in fact, been deliberately spread—that the Guild system is one which can be fitted quite comfortably into the present industrial structure: that you can have, without disturbing capitalism, some kind of "reform on Guild lines": that it may perhaps provide that alternative to revolutionary change for which our capitalist politicians are desperately seeking. Profit-sharing and "some voice in control" are the favorite devices by which it is hoped to stave off the demand of the workers for the socialization of industry. And these things, we are blandly assured, are "in accordance with Guild principles."

The outstanding instance was the case of the Whitley Councils. A couple of years ago the "Whitley" machinery was being extensively—and expensively—boomed as the remedy for all our industrial ills. We were assured that their formation was tantamount to a "peaceful revolution": that they conceded all the essential things that the workers were demanding: and of course that they were a big step toward National Guilds.

The real fact was that the most trenchant and outspoken of all the critics of Whitleyism were the National Guildsmen. They repudiated any connection between their ideas and the proposals of the Whitley Committee. They stripped the report of all its verbiage and pointed out to the Labor movement that it gave nothing whatever of what the workers were demanding. They prophesied that in practice all the fine words about Labor having a voice in control would prove mere "eyewash": and

that the Councils would be nothing more than an extension of the "conciliation" machinery which, in some trades, has existed for many years.

They have, of course, proved to be absolutely right in their analysis. The glory has departed from "Whitleyism." It has quite evidently neither accomplished a peaceful revolution, nor allayed industrial unrest, nor done anything beyond providing some additional machinery for the discussion and settlement of ordinary trade disputes about wages and hours.

But still you may hear people tell you that the Whitley Councils are based on Guild principles. Only the other day a German diplomatist assured me that the rather similar Industrial Council project of the German Government (which met with fierce opposition from the Independent Socialists) was an attempt to put the Guild idea into practice. And I have little doubt that this kind of thing is still being seriously stated in America.

That is why I want to devote this article to saying one thing very definitely and firmly. It is this: that Guild Socialism is a revolutionary doctrine. Perhaps it is as well to add—in view of the state of mind of a good many people in America just now—that by revolutionary I don't mean anything connected with bombs or barricades or armed insurrections. When I say that it is revolutionary, I mean that it envisages a complete change in the whole industrial structure of society: that it demands the abolition of capitalism and the wage system; that it implies the ending of production for profit and of the treating of Labor as a commodity; and that it is entirely incompatible with the retention of any of these things. You cannot have a guild system under capitalism. The thing is a contradiction in terms. As well might you talk of establishing democracy under a despot.

The starting point of the whole Guild Socialist movement is, in fact, the definite affirmation that all reform within the four walls of the capitalist system is illusory: that neither an equitable distribution of wealth, nor the freedom which is a greater thing than that, can be secured except by the abolition of the wage system itself; that while men's labor power is bought and sold, while industry is carried on for the making of profits for the capitalist class, economic freedom is impossible; and that without economic freedom political democracy is a mere illusion.

We are out not in the least to make capitalism more efficient or more tolerable. We are out to destroy it: and we can no more compromise with wage slavery than the Abolitionists could compromise with chattel slavery. There are proposals now for improving the relations between employer and employed, as there were proposals in the days of chattel slavery for improving the relations between slave-owner and slave. But they, whatever their intrinsic merits, are beside the main issue, which is

that of freedom. And freedom can only come, not by the improvement, but by the abolition, of that relationship. Economic freedom can only come when the producers, instead of being divided into employers producing for profit and employees selling their labor-power, are organized as associations of free men producing cooperatively for the needs of the whole community.

That, and nothing less, is our objective. We do not imagine that the change must of necessity come suddenly and catastrophically. That does not rest with us to decide. And a comparatively gradual transition is still within the bounds of possibility. We are ready—and more than ready—to welcome any change that does actually involve a transference of power from the capitalists to the community. We would welcome any "instalment of control" that does really transfer control from the employers to the workers. We would welcome any measure of nationalization provided that it does not propose merely to substitute for the private capitalist the bureaucracy of a capitalist state. We would welcome these things and we press for them as the most hopeful method of achieving the inevitable revolution with the minimum of disturbance.

We would welcome these things: but we do not see them coming except by the coercion—political or industrial—of an unwilling master class. Instead, we see an obstinate resistance opposed to every change which would really make a breach in the wage-system. We see a privileged class willing to run every risk and to expose the community to every danger rather than abdicate a shred of its power. We see no signs of any willingness to make real concessions to the demands of organized labor.

Instead, we see a diligent scattering of dust for the eyes of the workers: a ceaseless offering of illusory reforms and of sham concessions. We see schemes put forward which are intended to delude and to distract attention from the real issues. We see proposals that are described as steps towards, but are intended as barriers against, the change we desire.

And we see these things being done in our name. The parentage of plans which we detest is ascribed to us. The name of Guild Socialism is affixed to every new device for the stabilizing and preservation of capitalism. We are in some danger of being regarded, especially outside our own country, as a kind of mild reformist fold, dabbling in schemes for "profit-sharing" and "joint-control."

Perhaps it doesn't much matter. But we don't like it. Whether you think better or worse of us for it, we would rather you know us for what we are, as believers in the need for a complete and revolutionary change, as believers that real freedom and a decent social order can only be achieved, not through the improvement, but through the abolition of the wage-system.

France and The Arabs

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

I WAS in Damascus last October. That was a year after the occupation of the city by the British and Arabs. The troopers of Prince Feisal were everywhere, some wearing the picturesque garb of the desert, some the regulation British uniform, and some a combination of the two. With rifles over their shoulders, a pistol or two in their belts, and with plenty of cartridges to match, they dashed through the streets on their "gaily bedecked" Arab steeds. To an American the scene was a combination "Arabian Nights" and "Buffalo Bill's Wild West."

There was excitement in the city and indeed in all of Syria, for it was rumored that the British would withdraw their troops. All knew what that meant—armed resistance on the part of the Arabs to the inevitable French occupation. The British in the critical days of the struggle with Germany had lighted and fanned the flames of Arab nationalism. The Arabs under King Hussein of the Hedjaz, a region of western Arabia, were incited to rebel against the Turks. They were told they would secure their independence! Not only that—they were encouraged to dream of a revival of the old Arab empire. That dream was almost at the point of realization. The Turks were vanquished. An Arab government was in Damascus. Prince Feisal had been favorably received at the Peace Conference.

But there was one obstacle to the realization of these nationalistic aspirations—French imperialism. John Bull had wooed two maidens at the same time. He had promised Syria to the French mademoiselle. He had led the Arab debutante to expect the same reward. He couldn't make good on both promises. I believe he would have preferred to favor the Arabs: certainly this was the sentiment of the officers and men there in the land, but political exigencies at Paris ruled otherwise. The Arabs realized this. They knew that the departure of the British from Damascus, Beirut, Tripoli, Homs, Aleppo, and other parts of Syria, meant the coming of the French; and that meant death to their dream of a new Arabia, a great Arab state. For that fundamental reason they did not like the French.

And there were other reasons for their hatred—for it was a hatred. The French had pulled down their flag when they had raised it over a public building. The French had committed other acts which proved the truth of what a British Colonel once told me: "The French have a faculty of annoying the people." Moreover, it was the French who, in protecting the Christian Maronites of the

Lebanon region in the middle of the last century, had left wounds among the Mohammedan population which had not yet healed. Then, too, while an occupation by the British or the Americans might bring material assistance to the country, the coming of the French promised nothing of the kind. The French themselves said they would make the country pay for itself.

These were some of the reasons for the hatred of the native population for the French, a hatred by no means confined to the Mohammedans. It was shared by the Druses, a strange fanatical sect of some two hundred thousand, neither Moslem nor Christian, who had been strong enough to defy the Turks; and by the Nusireiyah, another sect possessing an esoteric religion and plenty of ammunition. The Christians, with the exception of the Maronites, much preferred the United States or England as a mandatory. Even the Protestant missionaries viewed with uneasiness the prospect of a French occupation, fearing the crippling of their schools by government interference.

Thus it came about that a year ago those of us who were in the land were convinced that the coming of the French meant war. Subsequent events have proved this. I doubt if there can be real peace in Syria as long as the French government controls—with the French government what it is today. When the "American Section of the International Commission on Mandates in Turkey," a commission from the Peace Conference, toured the country and heard representatives of the people, there was no unanimity as to whom they wanted as mandatory, but there was an almost unanimous expression as to whom they did not want. And this in spite of an extensive French propaganda—a propaganda that went so far as to hire little children of the villages to cry "*Vive la France*" whenever strangers passed through and inspired articles in a Beirut paper that the American Relief work carried on in the land was merely an American scheme to take the country.

To maintain their position as the governing power in Syria, the French will require constant vigilance and thousands of troops. The Arabs will not submit for long. They are well armed and they know how to shoot. At the present moment life and property are safe only in the coast towns. The Arabs are fired with what the English-speaking ones generally called "President Weelison's self-determination for little beebles." They believe they have a right to their own land. They believe they can govern it. Any peace which does not give them a chance to try it cannot last.

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

The Bondage of Compulsory Education

IN the August number of THE WORLD TOMORROW we are invited to discuss this most important question:

"How shall we get universal education without making the schools propaganda agencies for the dominant political and economic groups to a degree which will stifle thought, prevent the proper development of the individual, and hinder social progress?"

At the risk of incurring the odium of being "destructive, not constructive" I have to say, with deep conviction: The present system and curriculum are a gigantic illustration of how not to do it.

The circumstance by which this question is made "acute" is the condemnation by the New York City School Superintendent of Principal Wolfson for "allowing high school students to vote in a straw ballot for 'a convicted felon' (Eugene V. Debs) and for permitting them to read the Socialist paper, *The Call*."

The above "acute" instance is only a natural manifestation of a great fundamental wrong which THE WORLD TOMORROW seems to indorse—at least, in phrase. Perhaps its substance has not been duly considered. I refer to "Compulsory Education." All the while I was a member of the Socialist Party I tried, in vain, to have that "demand" taken out of the platform. In it are the essence and seed of the incalculable wrongs done to our children by our mis-called "education." Mis-called, as anyone can see by comparing the root of the word with our methods.

Under the heading of "Giving the Children a Chance" (THE WORLD TOMORROW, Aug., p. 230) the Kentucky legislature is praised for "a compulsory attendance law" and an "increased budget of the State Board of Health from \$75,000 to \$135,000." On the last page, same number, the "National Child Labor Committee" says that "Alabama passed a good compulsory school-attendance law . . . and increased the facilities of the State Department of health."

I wish all lovers of liberty could see whether these things tend. It grieves me unspeakably to see the number of good men and women who are working for a system that inevitably results in just such deplorable instances as the one cited in New York City. Not only that—they are helping to establish a certain school of medicine in the state to the destruction of all medical freedom. A medical oligarchy, which is fast and subtly building itself, largely through our public school system, is no whit less dangerous to liberty than a state religion.

"Compulsory education" has been so universally accepted, is so fixed in the public mind, as to cause one almost to despair of making any effective protest against it. And yet that is turning our schools into "Mediocrity Mills," which "grind exceeding small"; "Grand Crams," which treat the pupils as empty receptacles into which are poured a mass of unrelated and indigestible facts; shambles, slaughtering individuality with ruthless zeal.

Do we pass compulsory feeding laws? Not yet; though I suppose if the "medicine men" have their way we shall presently come to that. We have, so far, enough common sense to know that all normal children like to eat and need no compulsion thereto. Also we ought to know that food taken without desire for it does more harm than good. It is just as true that children are mentally hungry and that forced mental aliment is injurious.

Where is the educational Moses who will insist on these great fundamental truths and lead us out of the bondage of "compulsory education"—affirm the right of every child to develop along the lines for which he is built instead of being distorted into a shape often entirely at variance with his nature. A radical and complete transformation of the ideas from which our present curriculum has been evolved must precede any healthy change. If New York City's School Superintendent had the respect for each child's individuality which is its due (though denied by compulsory education) and without which no one is fit to deal with children, it would have kept him, whatever his own political preference may be, from a silly and unjust act.

A full discussion of the tremendous issues set forth in the question quoted at the beginning would take more space than is contained in several issues of THE WORLD TOMORROW. I have only tried to show the principle from which it seems to me the discussion must proceed to be of any real value.

CELIA BALDWIN.

Denver, Colorado.

Imperfect, but a Stupendous Advance

I AM accustomed to distinguish you from the editors of many of the New York uplift journals. The impression seems to prevail among them that their judgments are infallible, and any suggestion of possible error in their reasoning is wasted. Some things in your columns have indicated a different spirit, and I venture to suggest a question with regard to a sentence in your number of August, 1920, page 1:

"Even if it [the League of Nations] were brought to life, so long as the imperialist temper prevails the League would only be a bungling instrument for fostering and perhaps adjusting the selfish motives of the Allied governments."

I am strongly reminded of that ancient phrase presumed to reflect the attitude of an anxious mother who bade the daughter, anxious to learn to swim, to "hang her clothes on a hickory limb," but not to go near the water lest she should drown. I mean not to jest but set forth seriously what seems to me to be the mistake in your attitude on the whole League of Nations question.

The world is of necessity ruled by reactionaries. A reactionary is merely a man who is in control at a given time and therefore does not want the world to

change. One needed not special information concerning the situation to prophesy at the beginning of the war that, when it was over, reactionary elements very largely would be in the saddle. One who should deny that would naturally fail to understand the certainties of the situation.

This is merely a phase of the problem of human evolution. We are dealing with people; therefore with fallible, weak and uncertain instruments. To assume that it is possible to have exactly the kinds of people ruling that we would like, that we will have a perfect government according to the ideals we cherish, is to make a fatal blunder. Any step in advance consists not in registering an improvement made, but in setting up machinery by which improvement may be made.

In mechanics we all know that every human invention is bungling, cumbersome and imperfect at its inception. When the first race of automobiles in this city was set a few years ago, it was a moot question whether any one of the contestants would be able to get over the course at all, and in fact few of them did. The progress of human invention always implies an imperfect instrument put into practice and gradually evolving through experience into a comparatively perfected instrument.

This is just as true in political machinery as in mechanics proper. The idea that a League of Nations could be born as Minerva was fabled to have been—full grown—is an error. That thing never happened in human history, and it never by any possibility can happen. Whether or not the League of Nations as planned is half as bad as its opponents assert, I do not know. It seems to be a waste of time to find out. It was an absolutely foregone conclusion, first, that it would be imperfect, and, secondly, that people who imagined a perfect settlement of human difficulties would be disappointed and hostile.

The essential thing is that we shall have an instrument the existence and acceptance of which would be an acknowledgment of the right of the people of one nation to object to abuses in another—a means by which public opinion of the world can bring pressure to bear upon backward nations, such, for instance, as our own, where labor legislation is concerned. The very establishment of a Labor Council of the World that might interfere with the right of exploitation of small children by a factory owner in Georgia or a Belfast manufacturer is the most stupendous advance that human history has seen in the last century, because it establishes an engine of the most tremendous possibilities.

Permit me to come back to the figure with which I started and to say that no means has yet been found of learning to swim without taking the inevitable risks of going into the water. Internationalism is not possible so long as we mean by it merely the right on our part to interfere with other nations without any reciprocal right on their part to interfere with our internal affairs. There can be no League of Nations capable of effective work in preventing wars and in spreading peace and civilization around the world which cannot be used by reactionaries temporarily for vicious purposes; but in the mysterious process of evolution every such instrument tends, like the gyro-

scope, to keep its balance and ultimately to fulfill its function.

Universities and public foundations founded by men of the established order inevitably tend in time to become centers of information and intelligence that break down that same established order.

EDWARD M. WINSTON.

Chicago, Ill.

Christianity's Contribution to Revolution

THE best answer to theory is fact. There are certain facts that in my judgment furnish an answer to the leading article in the October number of *THE WORLD TOMORROW* by C. Delisle Burns. We grant that religion is a conservative force in life, and it moves slowly enough to arouse impatience; but, after all, does it not furnish the thing that gives rise to that very impatience? I will not undertake to show the revolutionary character of the work of the ancient Hebrew Prophets, or that in the words of Jesus we find sufficient dynamite to blow a multitude of institutions to thunder; but just let us look at some facts nearer our doors.

Take the French Revolution, English Chartism, American Populism and Socialism. Among the fore-runners and agitators of the French Revolution, Voltaire and Rousseau revolted from the law to letters and agitation; but Diderot was educated for the ministry, and his life work of condensing six hundred books into a compendium of knowledge for democracy cannot be overlooked. Marat was a scholar and physician who left elegance to live in cellars; Chaumette was a teacher and student who became the French Ben Franklin, securing separate beds for patients in hospitals and free reading for convalescents, opened public libraries and suppressed the lotteries where the poor were huddled, softened treatment of criminals, founded an asylum for infants and a home for unmarried mothers. D'Alembert was a lawyer, Helvetius a doctor, Baboeuf a surveyor; but Selys, St. Just, Morelly, Boissel, Mably, Volney, Linguet, Condillac, D'Holbach, Cantillon were all educated in the church and intended for the ministry. And if we will go back of all to the teacher and guide of Voltaire, we come to Jean Meslier, the priest born in 1664, a man who was great of intellect and preached a revolution to abolish private property over three hundred years ago. Meslier, the priest, was the first man in modern times to show that private property means inequality; that inequality means injustice and oppression; and that only in economic equality could come political and social liberty.

In England it was the Christian teachers like Kingsley and Maurice who preached against social injustice; the same was true of Mazzini in Italy. In the Agrarian political uprising in the Western States in 1892 to 1896, the best agitators were the various preachers who espoused Populism. In the Socialist movement, how active and tireless and fearless were W. D. P. Bliss, Thurston Brown, George Herron, Stitt Wilson, Ricker, Father McGrady, Alexander Irvine, George Lunn—all preachers. What follower of Henry George was more sincere and devoted than Father McGlynn?

Now it does not establish the point Delisle Burns

seeks to make to say the regular church objected to these men—perhaps cast them out. The fact is, they were religious men—trained in religion; the idealism that gave them impulse and philosophy was religion, Christianity. The message of Jesus is so much larger than the average man can grasp that the average man, who makes up the institutional church, makes that church an institution which cramps the very spirit she creates.

True it is that in Russia at present revolution is in the hands of un-religious leaders, but the seeds which made revolt possible were sown by Tolstoy and many a

humble religious soul. And Russia is offset by Ireland, where the most fearless revolutionists are religious in the extreme.

Religion, and, above all, Christianity, is not against progress—even though that progress come by revolutionary methods. The Founder of Christianity was a fearless reformer—he gave his life because of his revolt—and the teachings he left stir to revolt against that which binds and cramps mankind. Christianity is a revolutionary force.

ROLAND D. SAWYER.

Ware, Mass.

Ex Libris

A Challenge to All Americans

The Great Steel Strike, by W. Z. Foster (B. W. Huebsch & Co.).

The Steel Strike of 1919—Interchurch World Movement Report. (Harcourt, Brace & Howe.)

IF we had greater faith in the efficacy of education by coercion we should like to make two books compulsory reading for every clergyman, newspaper editor, politician, and employer in the United States. These two books are *The Great Steel Strike* by W. Z. Foster (B. W. Huebsch & Co.) and *The Steel Strike of 1919*, the report of the Interchurch World Movement's Commission published by Harcourt, Brace & Howe. The first of these books has all the interest of the report of a general on a great campaign in which he was the leader. The comparison is inadequate, for few wars are as significant as the campaigns of labor, and generals' reports are numerous; whereas labor leaders have rarely taken the time or had the interest to sit down and analyze the strength and weakness of the strikes which they have led. It is precisely this that Mr. Foster has done. He draws a vivid picture of events, all of which he saw and a large part of which he was. His judgment is cool and dispassionate; he sees the faults in the labor movement, but he imparts to his readers a tremendous admiration for the men who could conduct so long a campaign against such terrific obstacles. That admiration, it must be confessed, belongs less to the leaders and the "grand dukes" of the A. F. of L. than to the rank-and-file workers.

So much has already been said in our pages about the Interchurch World Movement's report that there is not much to add except to say that the volume which contains it is clear, concise, and readable as well as authoritative. As we marvel at Louis XIV's absolute dominance of the state, so may our descendants marvel at Judge Gary's control of a basic industry. Here is the situation: Steel products are absolutely fundamental in modern civilization. The work of steel making is arduous and dangerous. The men who do these necessary tasks of production live for the most part in miserable houses, huddled about huge mills. A large proportion of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers are foreigners of different nationalities with imperfect knowledge of English, cut off from the common life of the community.

In the United States Steel Corporation alone 69,000 of the men work a twelve-hour day. This is approximately half of the total number, and of these approximately half work a seven-day week. The annual earnings of over a third of the workers are and have been for years below the level set by government experts as a minimum of subsistence. The annual earnings of 72 per cent. of all workers are below the level set as the minimum of comfort. These wages are determined wholly arbitrarily. The workers have absolutely no voice in the industry in which they invest all their strength and most of their waking hours. Nor is this all. In order to keep these wage slaves in their place the steel companies employ spies and under-cover men. They discharge employees not merely for leadership in labor organization, but even for reading too much literature of "a wrong sort." They control the government of the mill towns. Not only private detectives but state constabulary do their bidding; civil liberties do not exist in most of western Pennsylvania not only during times of strike, but even in ordinary times. Such is the background of the strike.

So far from being Bolshevik in aims and purposes, as both Mr. Foster and the Interchurch World Movement's Commission agreed, the great steel strike was waged for a right which in England has for a long time been regarded as elemental; namely, the right to organize and bargain collectively. After a heroic struggle which bade fair to develop something of a new technic in labor organization and in provisioning a great army of hungry people, the strike failed. Why? First because of the enormous financial strength of the steel companies themselves and their entrenched power in the industry; secondly, because government agencies and public opinion were on the side of the employers; and thirdly, because of weakness in the American labor movement. The second of these reasons is a standing reproach to the American people. It is probably not true that the steel company bought up public opinion—that would be impossible—but their great financial power undoubtedly gave them some measure of direct control over churches, newspapers, and the like. The real point is, however, that such was the state of the public mind, the hang-over from war hysteria and the fear of Bolshevism throughout the middle class in regard to labor unrest, that the public fooled itself. It

never sought to injure into the cause of the strike or to do justice. With a few honorable exceptions, neither in the pulpits nor among the newspapers nor among the rank and file of business men was there any voice raised for the working out of a program of rational progress in a basic industry. Regardless of what might happen in the future, the only concern of the public seemed to be to crush the strike.

The other factor of unusual interest is the weakness of American labor unionism. Mr. Foster in the preface to the second edition of his book criticizes the Interchurch World Movement's Commission for judging the unions "by standards of perfection" and overlooking the great advances in tactics they made. There is force in his criticism. Nevertheless, he himself in that same preface denounces the action of the Amalgamated Association (on which we have previously commented) as treason to the workers; and in an interview which appears the very day this review is written he takes the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. severely to task for postponing the attempt to organize the workers. He denounces this action as a repudiation of promises made at the time of the strike, as bad tactics and bad ethics. No intellectual could say more; in reality the "grand dukes" of the A. F. of L., and in particular the leaders of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers (on the whole a union of skilled workers) have been guilty of a pitiful betrayal of tens of thousands of unskilled immigrant workers who put their trust in them. Not only the middle-class public, but the old school of labor leaders must remember that if ever these exploited workers do turn to violence it will be because in the hour of their weakness and oppression they did not receive help or justice. The books that tell the story of the steel strike have more than a historical interest—they are a challenge to the makers of American public opinion to say whether they are indifferent or powerless before the autocracy personified by Judge Gary; and to the American labor movement to say whether it can find and express a solidarity greater than that which some of its leaders have understood.

High Literary Criticism

A Guide to Russian Literature (1820-1917). By Moisey F. Olgin (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

FOR anyone who is interested in modern Russian literature here is an important and fascinating book. It is a string of terse gems of literary criticism, brief resumés of the general characteristics and the chief individual books of a host of recent Russian writers. Mr. Olgin has managed to convey an exceptionally colorful and rich picture of each of these writers, with a good deal of detail crowded into a small space. Here are those familiar names, Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoi, Chekhov, etc., and a host of others that to most of us have not been even names. The years from 1820 to 1917 are divided into three periods, and the authors in each period are introduced by a general summary of the social and literary characteristics of their time.

The following brief passage will give a hint of the qualities that make the book vivid reading:

"Of all the voices in modern Russian literature,

Zaitsev's is the lowest. It is tender and fragile. It melts away in the distance. It leaves the impression of a silent prayer.

"Zaitsev writes stories. They tell real facts about real people. They do not shun the mire and the evil of existence. Yet they always touch the strings of lyricism, and longing arises in their wake, happy longing akin to sadness.

"Zaitsev pictures life. He is in the midst of it. There is strife and hatred and blood in his stories. There is the clash of wills, of passions, of ideals. There is brutal force often triumphant. Yet over the turmoil and the ugly noises Zaitsev spreads the cover of lofty silence. It hangs over all and pacifies all and bridges the space between the passing happenings of the earth and the silent roads to eternity. . . .

"Zaitsev is the most ecstatic of all modern Russian writers. He is like a saint that lives in the wilderness; a man that has seen much pain and much travail and much sin, and has retained a pure, kind, gentle soul, able to bless God for every ray of light, for every whiff of the summer breeze. Zaitsev is drunk with joy, but he is never riotous. Only his voice trembles with suppressed emotion."

Why Woman?

Woman. By Magdeleine Marx (Thomas Seltzer.)

BARBUSSE in his introduction ranks Magdeleine Marx "among the loftiest poets of our age," and on the jacket of the book there is fulsome praise from Romain Rolland, Barbusse again, and I know not what other names to confure with. In view of this, the reader perforce approaches *Woman* with respect.

And criticizes it with diffidence. . . . Yet it does seem to me that the book might more appropriately have been called *A Woman*. For example, the woman in question loves her husband deeply and abidingly, and that love is again and again heartily described. There comes the time when she falls in love with another man, and gives herself to him wholly. Yet in the midst of this experience she tells her husband sincerely: "Since he came, if you only knew, I love you more. . . . To go to him is to continue myself; it is not to lessen you." Now, in my humble opinion as an individual—a male, if you will—anyone who can be equally in love with two people at the same time is exceptional. I know quite a number of people who are polygamous in their affections seriatim—none that I can recall have been synchronously polygamous. It is my humble experience that the passion of love takes in one object at a time, to the temporary exclusion of others. So, for this reason if no other, it seems to me that the author presumes somewhat in calling her book by a generic term and implying that it is a startling and novel presentation of new truths regarding the psychological processes of woman.

But then, says the Woman in confessing to her husband: "Let us forget that man retains the proud authority of the male in his flesh and say 'possess' as of a thing." Which leads me to suspect that the author may have worked up her little triangle not out of emotional experience but out of her head, to refute an idea. . . . However, I am one, and mankind is many. I may be quite wrong.

For the rest, the book is perfervid in a way that we do not quite like in America, perhaps because we are not wholly acclimated to it. It has pages of unusual beauty, and a high degree of unity and directness.

Southern Seas

The Rescue. By Joseph Conrad (Donbleday, Page & Co.).

TO read a novel of Conrad's is to be lifted out of yourself and travel on swift pinions to seas and islands of romance. It is to feel hot, tropical winds, to bask in the broiling sun, to toll through torrid days, to thrill to great ventures. It is to see vividly spread out before you a powerful group of lives; to witness a titanic struggle toward an ideal, frustrated in the end by some intangible fate—the burnished and sunlit path of youth darkened and turned to leaden gray or swept by a tornado. It is to be stirred and stirred again by high romance, and in the end chilled by reality. Any novelist who can do these things to you is a master, to be read avidly.

Conrad does it all over again in *The Rescue*. When you have read it you are in a state of mind to say: "After him, the Deigne."

An Artist in the Short Story

Youth and the Bright Medusa. By Willa Cather (Alfred A. Knopf).

THE Bright Medusa is art; and each story in the collection deals with some phase of youth's many adventures with art—and life. Whether delicately and by implication or strongly and directly, the stories are all tragic. There is an undercurrent, too, of that disillusion which is inseparable from the tragedies of youth.

Miss Cather is one of a small group of American authors who are producing literature of a high type and adding to the literary laurels of America in Europe. She is an artist with a sure touch in moulding a plot and depicting a motive. The longer stories here—*Coming*, *Aphrodite* and *The Diamond Mine*—are consummate in both respects. The shorter stories are nicely polished examples of short-story art. Indeed, the book is meat for several pleasurable hours.

Rolland Satirizes War

Liliul. By Romain Rolland (Boni & Liveright).

A fantastic and bitter allegorical satire on war written in the last year of the conflict. Here are youth sacrificed for illusion, nations sent to the shambles for plutocrats and munition makers, men shackled by superficial doctrines of liberty and fraternity, intellectuals saving their skins and chorusing strife, the bourgeois Father God who fights on both sides of the battle. Here, in fact, are all the arguments and experiences with which the pacifist is familiar incisively personified—not without a certain strong tang of a former literary age, as in the picture of Truth as a lusty and ardent damsel athirst for the promiscuous embraces of all and sundry who care to seek her. No summary can give more than a heavy picture of Rolland's fanciful allegory, and the reader must get its quality himself.

Einstein Simplified

Easy Lessons in Einstein. By Edwin E. Slousoff (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

THERE are some of us not gifted with mathematical minds who believe that death has lost part of its sting when we consider that at least we, unlike the rising generation, will not have to study mathematics and physics according to the principles of Einstein. Nevertheless, we should like to know what is in store for our children. We get some information and reassurance from this very clever and clear little book written by Edwin E. Slousoff. One who by means of it has seen glimmers of light in his mathematical darkness recommends it to his fellow ignoramuses and perhaps to some who are not so ignorant. The doctrine of relativity in philosophy is no very new thing, but relativity in physics is new. It is worth the layman's while to try to grasp something of its significance.

Some Books Recommended by Our Readers

IN reply to the suggestion in our last issue that our readers send us from time to time lists of books and magazine articles that they have found helpful, we have received the following:

Recommended by Dr. S. Edward Freta of Whitestone, L. I.:

Red Europe, by Frank Anstey, M. P.

How the War Came, by Earl Loreburn.

Truth and the War, Pre-War Diplomacy, Teardrop's Part in the War, Horrors on the Rhine, Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy, by E. D. Morel.

Patriotism, Truth and War Guilt, by Demartini.

The Craft Sinister, by George A. Schreiner (Published by G. A. Geyer, New York).

Recommended by E. S. Cardoso, Richmond, Va.:

The Mind in the Making, by James Harvey Robinson (a series of four articles beginning in the September issue of *Harper's Magazine*).

Remember the Lusitania

"Attacking enemy commerce is a legitimate act of war."

"The question of sinking enemy merchant ships on sight is perfectly justifiable; such ships form part of the lines of communication. As for sinking neutral ships, that is chiefly a question of policy. If the neutral is one to be feared, then it is naturally bad policy to arouse his indignation."

"The Germans acted up to their principle and sank many ships without warning. Such a definite rule for submarine warfare is undoubtedly the best."

"To abolish the submarine would be to compromise. This is generally fatal to strategy. If war is to be abolished these idealists should banish all armaments. The other alternative is to be provided with every weapon which modern science can devise, whether it has been banned by Hague Conventions or not."

The above paragraphs, reader, are not taken from a speech delivered by Admiral Tirpitz. They are from an essay on Naval Warfare, which has been awarded a prize by the Royal United Service Institution of Britain.—*The Worker*.

ARMISTICE DAY

November 11th

**SHALL IT BE USED TO GLORIFY THE PAST? or
SHALL IT BE USED TO BUILD FOR THE FUTURE?**

Two years ago the formal hostilities of the Great War ceased. Efforts toward rebuilding the shattered foundations of international co-operation were begun. But the hope of millions that the nations would begin to disarm has not been realized.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, writing in 1917, voiced the judgment of the world:

"Large Armaments are a Certain Road to War"

On this Armistice Day, when the world is staggering under the burdens of the past war and governments are planning greater armaments than ever, should not our slogan be:

"Let America Lead in Disarmament"

Fear holds the nations in bondage to the old system.
Suspicion and jealousy prevent anyone from taking the lead.
Courage and unselfishness are needed for the forward step.

Our Strength Demands That America Set The Pace

**WHAT BETTER TRIBUTE TO THOSE WHO GAVE
THEIR LIVES TO END WAR?**

Dedicate Armistice Day to Their Unfinished Work

WANTED:

A stenographer and typewriter in a lawyer's office. Interest in work for Negro education and the Society of Friends would be an advantage.

L. HOLLINGSWORTH WOOD

20 Nassau Street,

New York City



Copies of the above advertisement in small poster form may be obtained on application to

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
118 E. 25th St., New York City

JUL 25 1921

The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 12

DECEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Political Prisoners in Europe

By Robert Ferrari

Religion's Entangling Alliances

By Herbert A. Miller

Education for the New Day

By Vida D. Scudder

The Great Lunacy

By An Eye-Witness

Two Years After. A Study in Intrigue

The Fellowship Press, Inc.
118 East 28th Street, New York, N. Y.

The World Tomorrow

Contents of the December Issue.

	Page.
Education for the New Day. By	
Vida D. Scudder.....	355
Signs of the Times.....	359
After two years.....	362
Beligion's Entangling Alliances. By	
Herbert Adolphus Miller.....	364
The Great Larceny. By An Eye-	
witness	370
A Study in Intrigue.....	373
Political Crime to Europe. By Rob-	
ert Ferrari.....	375
A Christmas Appeal.....	378
Open for Discussion.....	379
Ex-Libris.....	381
The Last Page. By The Wayfarer.....	383

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

VIDA D. SCUDDER is professor of English at Wellesley College and well known as a writer on social themes.

PROFESSOR H. A. MILLER occupies the chair of Sociology in Oberlin College. In connection with our Government Slave Bureau during the war and as the organizer of the Mid-European Union of representatives of oppressed nationalities seeking independence, he accomplished a notable service. He has spent the summer traveling in Central Europe, and in Czechoslovakia he was the guest of President Masaryk.

ROBERT FERRARI is a practicing lawyer in New York City; has been a lecturer in criminology at New York University, traveling fellow in Columbia University for study in Europe in continental law and criminology, instructor on the staff of the law school of the University of Paris; is now associate editor of the *Journal of Law and Criminology*, Chicago.

SCOTT NEARING is widely known as a lecturer and writer.

BRENT DOW ALLISON was confined in Ft. Leavenworth Penitentiary as a conscientious objector.

Avoid the Christmas rush
by shopping through
The World Tomorrow
See our advertisement on
the last page of this issue

The World Tomorrow

Vol. 111. December, 1920. No. 12.

Published by

The Fellowship Press, Inc., publishers,
118 East 29th St., New York.

Gilbert A. Beaver, President; L. Hollingsworth Wood, Treasurer; John Nevin Sayre, Secretary.

EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE WORLD TOMORROW: Norman Thomas, Editor; Gova Hambridge, Assistant Editor; Ruth Standish Baldwin, Edward W. Evans, Walter G. Fuller, John Haynes Holmes, Agnes Brown Leach, John Howard Melish, Richard Roberts, Ridgely Torrence, Oswald Garrison Villard, Harry F. Ward.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month, price fifteen cents a copy; annual subscription in the United States \$1.50; Canada \$1.75; other countries of the Postal Union, \$1.75. Orders for copies, subscriptions, and all correspondence should be sent to **THE WORLD TOMORROW** at The Fellowship Press, 118 East 29th Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as Second Class matter March 8, 1914, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Statement of the ownership, management, circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of **THE WORLD TOMORROW**, published monthly, at New York, N. Y., for October, 1920, State of New York, County of New York. Before me, a notary public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Norman M. Thomas, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of **THE WORLD TOMORROW**, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, in wit: That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are: Publisher, Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 East 29th St., New York City; Editor, Norman M. Thomas, 118 East 29th St., New York City; Managing Editor, Norman M. Thomas, 118 East 29th St., New York City; Business Manager, none. That the owners are: The Fellowship Press, Inc., 118 East 29th St., New York City; Agnes Brown Leach, 170 East 64th St., New York City; John Nevin Sayre, Katonah, N. Y.; Paul Furnas, 501 Fifth Ave., New York City; L. Hollingsworth Wood, 20 Nassau St., New York City; Norman Thomas, 118 East 29th St., New York City; Gilbert A. Beaver, 118 East 29th St., New York City.

That the paragraph next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contains not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given; also that the said paragraph contains statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest, direct or indirect, in the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by him.

(Seal)

NORMAN M. THOMAS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of September, 1920.

P. A. RITCHIE.

(My commission expires March 30, 1921.)



The World Tomorrow

A Journal looking toward a Christian World

Vol. III. No. 12

DECEMBER, 1920

15 Cents

Education for the New Day

By VIDA D. SCUDDER

IDEALS of education vanish under our eyes. Gone the English idea that a man was educated if he could quote Horace and play a good game at cricket; gone to join the Persian picture of the youth to whom society had done its duty when it had taught him to ride straight and speak the truth. Gone, or going, the segregated class-training with sharp distinctions of sex, which at its best produced in privileged girls lovely manners, attractive accomplishments, and personal charm,—in privileged youths, chivalrous virility touched by love of adventure, and sense of responsibility toward inferiors. Enter education democratic, enter education Freudian. Enter, on the one hand, the "Commercial High," and the technical school; enter, on the other, the delightful idea that the chief business of the educator is to remove inhibitions—an idea, this last, which destroys all ancient standards of drill and discipline, and lets each little Montessori child work out his or her preferences unchecked, to his or her ultimate misery.

Myriad experiments are tried on the unlucky young. They tell us that they have "had" this or that as if it were a matter of measles, a malady experienced and left behind. They reach us, these young folk, at college age, crusted as it were with a chaotic mosaic casually applied: here a dab of science, there a purple patch of Arthurian Romance, here Hygiene, here Folk-dancing, here Civics. And what of the living creature within the crust? Alas! When we seek to penetrate, we find him in a state of nature; a little cramped and dulled, probably, but totally unaffected in his real self by any of the processes to which he has been subjected.

In the confusion of experiment, it is not easy to generalize. But two salient facts surely stand out concerning the broader trend of modern education. Our training makes for two results, one intentional, the other inevitable; it proceeds under the protecting care of the twin genii, Efficiency and Mediocrity.

The chief point that distinguishes education today from older types is that it aims at production rather than personality. It wants to make people practically useful, and it pays little attention to what kind of people they are. Action, not being, is its objective.

This tendency is a natural expression of an epoch which has put Production above Humanity: which has feverishly toiled to control and increase our material resources, at whatever sacrifices of human beings to the exigencies of the machine. But the vast procession of men is slowly turning to face another way. Most units in the procession do not realize this yet; but the word has gone out, and the column is curving, and presently even the laggards will reach the cross-roads and find themselves marching toward a new goal.

The chief point of the social order we are entering is the proposal to put less stress on production of physical values and more on the creation of men; less on machinery, more on life. Years ago Ruskin made the Victorians contemptuously angry when he said, "There is no wealth but life." Yet that is what the workers mean, in their stubborn fight for leisure and decent, secure well-being. That is what Russia is going after, blindly perhaps; that is the point of the revolution everywhere. Efficiency, by all means, gentlemen: increase of commodities, ease in exchange, what you will. But never to this Moloch will we sacrifice the joy or freedom of one tender adolescent, the health or vision of one working man. The end of our economic system shall be not the multiplication of goods, but the direct enlargement and enrichment of personality.

For we observe that the rage for production has made the race the victim of its own activities. We know the disconcerting proportion of men found during the war in every country to be below the normal physical standard. We meet on every side that curse of mediocrity, resting on our intellectual

life—the banal, machine-made minds, the development among abler men of a type alert, competent, but hard, insensitive; the atrophy of the higher powers of joy. We reject therefore the miserable complex of modern civilization. It is our firm resolve to break this sorry scheme of things, and remould it nearer to the heart's desire. There will be a time for salvage; no one denies that there are some precious values to retain. But something is wrong which must be put right with our economic foundations. In our effort to change them, catastrophe may await us; but we cannot stop the effort if we would. For the impetus is up, the power is on.

It is the young who will fully share the future conditions, and to prepare the young is our task. The task is stern in a way; for the world in which they are to live is not likely to be either peaceful or prosperous.

One might as well face facts. The old aim at efficiency was not wholly thwarted. For large sections of the population, civilization has been a pretty comfortable affair; life has been soft, commodious and easy. Now, that comfort is not likely to last. Even if no dramatic disaster befalls, Efficiency—own sister, she, to Ruskin's Goddess of Getting On—will probably desert us for a time at least; and a nerve-racked race, spent with emotions, but at last set free from goad and external pressure, may pass through a phase of exasperating laziness and incompetence. Symptoms are visible already. The lady who has never worked eight hours on end in her life is filled with moral horror as she sees how careless men are about their jobs, and how those awful unions make them throw down their tools at five o'clock. Lenin, over in Russia, has found it necessary soundly to berate the emancipated Russian workmen, and to preach thrift and energy, quite in the tone of the sententious employer. Everybody is getting slack; and men will be slacker before they are energetic again, for there is a psychological reaction from long-continued mechanical pressure which will take time to wear away.

This reaction will wear off by degrees. There is good reason to hope that one of these days, when workmen own their work and know what that involves, they will labor with a new kind of zest, more enlightened and keener than slave-labor has ever known. We are not likely to slip back into savagery; we shall probably continue to have automobiles and bathrooms; and some time the creative instincts of men will be asserting themselves with undreamed vigor. But reactions take time; and the children now growing up will in all probability live out their days in a world which is lazier, more demoralized than the world of their fathers. A world in which all the wheels will be out of gear, a baffling world, hard to live in, awaits us.

How shall we prepare our children to live in it?

It is obvious to say that they must be held to good standards for work. The offspring of the so-called leisure class, in particular, are perhaps the people who must be chiefly relied on to keep the world going. They have fairly healthy bodies in the main, and they are not handicapped by the hungry passion for rest and freedom which the present working classes cannot be blamed for feeling. It should be a simple matter to imbue them with a new chivalry, as class distinctions become blurred and disappear. The old incentive of private profit may be much diminished as the young reach maturity; but a better motivation must take its place. Technique must not be allowed to lapse if we can help it, and vocational training must be carried on under a higher inspiration than now, when the prime object is to enable men to earn their living.

But if we aim first at use, or usefulness, we shall repeat the blunder which has plunged us into all our difficulties. Education should right-about-face, with the procession. It should aim, and that immediately, not at making men more useful, but at making them more alive.

Not Efficiency, but Personality, is the spiritual word; and the opportunity of our age is the opportunity to release the Spirit.

The Christian will not care overmuch to equip the rising generation to make the poor world rich again; he is not sure enough that comfort and well-being are benefits. But he will be very concerned to develop men and women who can be the right kind of citizens in the new social order. And the first necessity is to enable people to live with fine serenity in difficult days,—to give them such rich resources in themselves that they will have no atom of regret for the old times, so pleasant on the surface, so corrupt within—the kind of resources that will be independent of circumstances, that can survive a shipwrecked world. It is the meek who inherit the earth, after all; and if we want men to possess their heritage, we must set about making them meek.

What does that mean? Well, for one thing it means discouragement of the aggressive, pushing, acquisitive instincts, and (since negative methods are always false in education) the supplanting of these instincts by a full development of the powers to enjoy without possessing: of the passive, contemplative powers, if you will, which were always given precedence of the active in more spiritual epochs, but which have been at such a discount in the West for two or three hundred years. Men must be taught to appropriate their heritage. The ignorance of it on the part of modern youth is amazing, is measureless. They can take an automobile to pieces and repair it, which is doubtless a useful accomplishment; but how many of them know the *Divine Comedy*? Yet a knowledge of Dante really does equip a man better to meet possible misfortune than knowing how to run an automobile.

To initiate people into their glorious inheritance, to make them sensitive to the best in it, eager for the possession of it, is our first educational duty. The laws of Nature, the achievement of humanity, will not fail us. They will endure, they will wait on our reverent study, though every factory in the land should close, though we be driven back on homespun and personally grown potatoes, as Mr. Brailsford expects.

To love true beauty, to learn real truth,—this is to gain personality. In one of Mallock's novels, a dull, handsome girl ruefully consults an older woman as to how she may become more attractive. Her friend tells her to learn the best of Wordsworth's poetry by heart, and by and by to look in a mirror and see if a new charm has not come into her face. This is an aside: but, speaking of Wordsworth, no one has suggested better than that wisest of English poets what education should do:

"We live by admiration, hope, and love,
And even as these are well and wisely placed,
In dignity of being we ascend."

There is a motto for our schools!

Young people nowadays too often grow up in a curious, hard apathy, scarcely admiring anything. To teach them to admire is to imbue them with reverence—a quality which democratic civilization needs to protect with jealous care. It means to quicken them, to give them severe accurate standards, by exposing them to what is beautiful and noble in every form. History, literature, and art can all be taught from this point of view. If the young are to be prepared and equipped to create a fairer and more genuine civilization than ours, they must gain the power to admire the right things. They can be taught to do so; nothing is more responsive to real excellence than a youthful mind. But in a world beset with blatant excitements, with coarse pleasures, a world of movies and cheap magazines, where the strident note is struck so constantly that finer melodies are hard to hear, it takes patience and brilliant energy to give the right training. Constant contact, enforced if need be, with the finest models, is essential; and a teacher who is himself honestly possessed by the perception of true excellence rarely fails to impart his passion to his students. It is quite possible to get a group of average Philistine boys and girls to the point where they would rather read Shelley than the *Saturday Evening Post*, and know, not because they are told so, but because they see, that Greek marbles are better to look at than a movie. The power of admiring rightly does not come by nature; it is the result of careful, protracted, and painstaking education, and there never could be conditions which make the task of the teacher in this line harder than it is today. But he can succeed, for he does succeed when he is the right man.

Next, hope. And hope means the forward-look-

ing mind. It means release from convention, timidity, dull acceptance of what is, simply because it is; it means flexibility and eagerness. A period of tremendous social experiment lies ahead. Let us prepare the rising generation to play their part with prudence, with zest, with trust in the future of the race. Hope, like most other good things, must be socialized. Personal expectations may not play so large a part in the immediate future; certainly some forms of personal ambition will be discredited. But a social hope, high, pure, tenacious, will be the sustaining power of these coming days. It must be founded, as all reasonable hope must be founded, on close study of the past; it must not be the kind of hope that flutters vaguely on weak wings in a rainbow mist, it must have precision in it; and young people can only acquire it as they are drilled in sound knowledge of history, of psychology, and of sociology. All these studies should be made to converge on the creation of purpose; for purpose is the final name, the ultimate end, of hope; and clear-sighted conviction of what is desirable and feasible in social experimentation is what the new world-order will grow by. Institutions, in the past, have come about in a fashion more or less haphazard; in the future, they must be the result of the reasoned purpose of disinterested men, and if the rising generation is to gain such purpose inspired by confident faith in its power to achieve, it must be enlightened by knowledge of the past and of human nature, and possessed by a religious conception of human destiny.

And love. Love is the key to every situation.

You cannot say to young people, "Love one another," and stop there, without falling into a slough of sentimentality. Unlucky children are sometimes led by their teachers to wallow in that slough, but the healthy-minded pull themselves out promptly and betake them to very hard dry land. Love is a difficult quest, slow and complex and beset with pitfalls. And it is quite peculiarly the modern quest. For unless love can be made stronger, wiser, more universal than it is, industrial democracy, soviet rule, guild socialism, and the rest, will be only a new type of mechanism.

Love is active and self-controlled fellowship, based on true understanding; and it is a perfectly practical thing, though unusual, to train young people and even little children into sympathy with alien minds and groups. We need immediately to encourage the clear and precise study of varying group-psychologies in the present and the past. History must teach us, not only how men acted, but why they acted as they did. Literature must teach us, not the meticulous fussing about sources (though this has its place), but the expansion of love. We must patiently teach the young to overcome the provincialism, the instinctive distrust of the alien, that today imprisons us all. We must break down

barriers; and just as we seek to understand ancient Greece and Rome and medieval Europe, so we must help people to understand I. W. W.'s, capitalists, Germans, Russians, and the rest of those outside their natural ken. Pride must be evoked on the side of sympathy—not in opposition to it, as has been the case in all forms of aristocratic idealism. For a psychology of imaginative sympathy is the first requisite of a stable new world. The love which education must develop must be rooted, not in passion but in imagination. It must echo Whitman: "I do not ask the wounded person how he feels; I myself become the wounded person." The noble expression of a modern idealist and martyr must be some day native to everyone: "So long as there is a soul in prison, I am not free."

Through admiration, hope, and love can be developed the power not only to inherit the joy and beauty of the world, but to add to them. Admiration always carries with it an imitative impulse; hope is in its nature constructive; and love is the creative force of the universe. Our aim is to enrich personality; but there is scant danger lest the joyous, the lovely, the well equipped persons of our desire slip into passive days and spend their lives in contemplation. The conditions of the world, for one thing, will hardly allow this luxury; the natural impulses, which set so strongly toward activity in a healthy organism, will not allow it. Let us create the right kind of people to live in the new and dawning day, and they will, automatically and spontaneously, be efficient people. But efficiency is not to be the first objective of our consideration. Rather, we are to remember the old saying, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." When men fix their first thought on Being, when they develop their latent faculties for perception, sympathy, and adoration, their doing will follow as naturally as fruit follows flower. Only it may be a very different kind of doing from what we see today.

There was something to be said after all in favor of the old aristocratic ideal of education. It produced, for a small minority, exquisite results: people finely-tuned, sensitive, emancipated, simple, the type of people whom we should grieve to lose out of the world. The acute fear of losing them is the reason why many cling ruefully to an aristocratic ideal, and refuse to surrender their minds to democracy. For this minority, the end of education, the end of life itself, has been, not working, not producing, but merely living. These few have been flowers in the rank human growth; but it has taken the benumbed toil of the silent millions to maintain them. These millions, so far as they were educated at all, were educated to do the world's work.

And when their hour struck, it was inevitable that the aristocratic ideal should go. A utilitarian and

practical conception seemed part of the whole democratic movement. Reinforced by modern materialism, it has dominated, and the demand is all but universal that people be trained, not for life itself, but for service to life. We are in the full swing of this theory, and the older cultures languish and die. Yet even the most ardent Democrat or Socialist, noting the dim mediocrity which befalls our national life and the vulgarity which taints it, must mourn their disappearance. So far does this regret go that one finds a liberal journal soberly stating that the only thing for an American to do, if he clings to the best intellectual traditions, is to flee his own country, above all the Middle West, and betake him to Europe. He will, according to this writer, render better service to general culture and thereby to American culture also by devoting his powers "to strengthening the centers of culture which at present lie elsewhere."

But this is a very pessimistic conclusion, to say nothing of the fact that old traditions are at present breaking down in Europe even faster than with us. Surely there is a better way. Mediocrity is the natural beginning of a strong democratic tendency, but it will not be the end. Democracy will not always remain inconsistent with "the humanization of man in society." As the old class-alignments vanish, we must aim at the union of the two ideals, envisaging an education open to all, carefully noting natural capacity and training for function, but also, and more fundamentally, opening the sources of power and joy in which all normal human beings share. Let us sedulously level up, not down; let us give personality its sacred right of way. At whatever sacrifice of comfort or immediate convenience, at whatever cost in commodities, let us aim first of all at making people beautiful, noble, happy and loving, fit citizens of an ideal commonwealth. And all those things which Efficiency connotes shall in due time be added unto us.

AS was expected, the Californians adopted the anti-Japanese land legislation by a large majority. In so doing, they did themselves no credit and by no means solved the immigration problem. Governor Stephens himself admitted that clever lawyers would doubtless find ways of getting around the law in so far as Japanese now in California are concerned. What has been accomplished has simply been to affront the Japanese and to make the problem of assimilating those now in the country more and not less difficult. We hope that those dispatches are correct which report that our State Department is on the eve of a new and amicable agreement with Japan on immigration.

Our War Department hails the Christmas season with an announcement of its success in perfecting poison gases. And no professor here as in England has refused a request to give his aid.

Signs of the Times

Freedom from Masquerade

THE Republican party will be responsible for what happens in the next four years. Debs, Mollie Steimer, and a host of others may stay in prison, the forces of the government may be turned to the support of the capitalist class, we may continue to have secret police in America which would have been the envy of the Tsar, and push our imperialism in Latin America; but all these things will not be accompanied by a noble hymn to freedom as has been the case under Mr. Wilson. It is good to have reaction wear its own colors and not masquerade under the cloak of liberalism. The next four years ought to be supremely educative.

Phases of the Protest Vote

THE protest vote was by no means contemptible.

The Boston *Transcript* thanks the Fathers of the Constitution "For the clever manner in which long ago they neutralized by means of the electoral machinery the formidable Socialist vote cast in the election last Tuesday." In more or less correct Bostonese it may be recorded that by its plain speech the *Transcript* has "spilled the beans." It might appropriately thank not only the Fathers of the Constitution but the election officials. In the districts where the Socialist vote was strong, they used every crooked device to count out Socialist candidates. It is to this cause that the defeat of Assemblymen Claessens and Waldman was due in New York. So flagrant was the manipulation in many New York districts that it is a wonder that the Socialists succeeded in electing one Congressman and five legislators. But despite all this it stands as an encouraging fact that in America, with all the conventional respectability and fear of wasting votes, nearly 2,000,000 people voted for a man in prison charged with sedition. But in so voting they honored themselves, for America contains no braver, truer man than Eugene V. Debs. In the Northwest the Nonpartisan League made a notable increase in the size of its vote. It retained control of the executive branch of the North Dakota government, though it probably lost the legislature. The governor-elect in Wisconsin was endorsed by it. The League was defeated in other states, but it deserves credit for sending a scientist and student of agricultural problems of the eminence of Dr. Ladd to the Senate from North Dakota. The Farmer-Labor Party did well in the State of Washington and in general made as good a showing as could have been expected considering its newness and lack of funds for a vigorous campaign. On the old party tickets there were a few men elected who made a vigorous stand against universal military service, and it is a matter of congratulation that

Congressman Davey of espionage law fame was defeated in Ohio. Certain reactionary candidates also ran far behind their ticket.

Unconstructive Discontent

NEVERTHELESS, when all is said and done, the protest vote by no means represents the amount of political discontent in America. There are several reasons which might be given. The Irish, for instance, did not love Harding, but as one of their leaders said, "They could not be driven to vote for Cox with a gatling gun." This because Cox stood for Wilson in their minds and they were so eager to make their repudiation of Wilson plain that they could not take a chance on minority candidates. There is another reason little discussed which was perhaps even more potent. Unemployment is rapidly increasing. Men and women with children to support decided with a kind of despair to vote for the party of "prosperity and big business." Perhaps the god, fortune, would be appeased if his high priests were returned to power. It is true that some extreme radicals abstained from voting as a protest against political action under the conditions that prevail in the United States. Others may follow their example in future elections. It is the plain truth that discontent in the United States is growing much faster than economic or political understanding. They who rejoice that the protest vote was not larger are sadly deceived. That fact by no means proves the security of the present order. It merely proves that in the political field as in the industrial constructive forces are of slow growth. The one absorbing question of our times is this: Can education go fast enough to prepare workers with hand and brain to carry on industry and government with a minimum of confusion?

"Labor Will Eat from the Employer's Hand"

THERE is a man famed in story who, having been kicked down stairs, on picking himself up issued a statement rejoicing that his adversary had stubbed his toe. With like optimism, Mr. Gompers hails the fact that fifty enemies of labor have been defeated for Congress. The total membership of the House and Senate is 534 (435 Representatives and 96 Senators). Seriously, this is no time for Pollyannas in the labor movement. Perhaps the least significant factor in the situation is the Republican landslide. More menacing to organized labor is widespread unemployment, the growing use of injunctions against labor, the virtual civil war that still continues in West Virginia, and the outrageous treatment of the striking coal miners in Alabama. In the latter state employees of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company are en-

tirely at the mercy of martial law administered by a state militia. There are no rights left to them. The Governor has forbidden them to march on the roads or to hold "mass meetings and assemblies in the open." In addition to the soldiers, private police in company pay patrol the mining villages. Thousands of evictions have occurred and writs of attachment been issued against the miners' property. Yet the strike has been peaceable. Little publicity has been given to the situation, which perhaps even more than the better advertised West Virginia strike illustrates the tremendous power of the alliance between the employers and the state to crush labor.

Labor Needs a Policy

IN face of this sort of situation, Mr. Gompers and the Grand Dukes of labor seem powerless. They have not as yet given effective backing to the Alabama coal miners, they have postponed the organization of the steel workers, they have defied the orders of the last A. F. of L. convention, and they are not carrying on a vigorous fight for the Plumb Plan. Their only constructive policy seems to be to put "conservative" leaders in control and piously urge the further restriction of immigration not merely because of unemployment in America, but to check "a rush of immigrants from radical areas of Europe and Asia." Nevertheless, the situation is not hopeless. One encouraging feature is the growth of the cooperative movement in the United States. Despite factionalism and personal bitterness among leaders of the movement, not only is the number of cooperative stores for the distribution of supplies rapidly increasing, but the whole idea is catching hold of the imagination of labor as never before. Mr. Frederic C. Howe, who is especially concerned with the development of cooperative banking, is optimistic as to the outlook. At present, labor gives whatever savings it has into the hands of the great financiers, to do with as they will. This is not necessary, and soundly organized and wisely managed cooperative banks, backed by labor union funds and the savings of the workers, would do more than any immediate political victory actually to break the strangle hold of the masters of credit and to educate labor in problems of business administration.

The Worker without a Union

UNEMPLOYMENT is not the fault of the individual employer. He also is the victim of the present situation. But it is the fault of some employers that they are taking advantage of labor's dire necessity to try to squelch unionism. Here is the Republican Publicity Association declaring war on Mr. Gompers just as if he were a Bolshevik. It waxes righteously indignant in behalf of the independent worker who faces "starvation and death" if he fails "to assign his independence" to the

union. A lot of this sort of talk is sheer bunk, and nobody knows it better than the talkers; but it is probably true that there are men who honestly think not merely that individual unions make mistakes, but that unionism itself is wrong. They ought to read history and know how entirely labor has depended upon organization for any advance that it has made in living conditions. The very men who talk about the dignity of the individual laborer who is free to match his strength against the might of the steel corporation would damn to the lowest pit of hell the individual who boasted of his independence because he was a man without a country. It ought to be obvious to the most superficial mind that the worker is as much dependent upon his fellow workers and owes at least as much loyalty to them as a man owes to his fellow citizens in the city or state. Unions have their faults; their philosophy may be inadequate to the time; but the last way in the world to cure these evils is to extol scabbing as a virtuous practice or to try to make it appear that any man is other than selfish who, because he thinks his own individual interests not furthered by the union, holds aloof from this one practical expression of working-class solidarity. One type of unionism may give place to another, evils in unions may be abolished, but they will be abolished by the unionist and not by the scab, who, though the hero of the publicity men, is the dupe of the employer.

Can We Do No Better?

OPTIMISTS talk wisely about this unemployment as a sign of business adjustment and the beginning of a period of deflation. All this wise talk does not alter the hard fact that a winter of widespread unemployment means immeasurable suffering for men and women and children. What has happened is fairly clear. We have profited by the war and by the sufferings of our brethren in Europe. No such prosperity can long endure; the strength that it gives is the strength of fever and not of health. Now we are paying the price for the orgy of war. It was inevitable that we would come to a time when inflation of credit and with it an enormous rise in prices could no longer give us a seeming prosperity. People simply could not pay for the goods they needed. Prices began to fall; the producers began to suffer. The farmers demanded credit which the Federal Reserve Board was unwilling to grant. They saw themselves under our profit system compelled to market their goods at a loss. No wonder they protested. In the South the protest has taken the form of the actual destruction of cotton at a time when a large part of the world shivers with cold. More recently, members of the Farmers' National Union have voted to curtail the production of grain in order to keep up prices. This is typical of the present situation. Never were the needs of men greater. Yet those who

would produce are kept in enforced idleness. And still we are told that the private ownership of land, capital, and natural resources, the wage system and the profit motive, make this the best of possible industrial worlds. The capitalist system animated by the profit motive will have to show miraculous skill in rectifying conditions which we confront or else it will fall. Sane men will not want it to fall before chaos, but before the steady development of a nobler order in industry. Of all the pessimists in the world, surely those are worst who argue that man who has made nature his servant cannot abolish the wastes and suffering both of war and our present industrial system. Are not such evils as surely symptoms of social ignorance and maladjustment as would be a visitation of some unclean plague?

The Irish Tragedy Grows Darker

VIOLENCE increases in Ireland. The shooting of fourteen British officers connected with Irish court-martials may satisfy a thirst for vengeance; it weakens the Irish cause and its appeal to the moral sentiment of the world. A policy of terrorism may prove as disastrous to the constructive power of Sinn Féin as it did to the Social Revolutionary party in Russia. But neither by the code of war nor that of peace do such shootings justify the terrible reprisals of the "black and tans," the murder of Father Griffin, and the use of machine guns against spectators at a Dublin football game. The famous English war correspondent H. W. Nevinson has been fearlessly revealing the true nature of the outrages committed by the "black and tans" in Ireland. It is in Englishmen of this sort that there is hope. The Chief Secretary for Ireland makes the astonishing charge that the commander-in-chief of the Republican Army is planning to spread germs of typhoid among British soldiers and glanders among the army horses. The charge is horrible, but the story does not carry conviction. The alleged letter from the "Commander-in-Chief" is anonymous and undated. There has been no epidemic of typhoid or glanders. Furthermore, British generals have been frankly discussing germ warfare, so that their minds naturally turn to it.* Finally, the Irish in a previous instance issued documents to prove that English secret service agents had deliberately forged letters on Sinn Féin stationery to disrupt the movement. Whether true or false, the story is a terrible commentary on the consequences of the attempt to hold Ireland by force. Against the dark features of the situation must be set the awakening of British labor. It has again formally demanded the withdrawal of troops and the holding of an Irish constitutional convention chosen by proportional representation, to whose ultimate decision no

strings are to be attached. It has appointed a representative commission to go to Ireland to investigate. It seems to us great ends might be served if the American commission now hearing evidence on Ireland would find a way to cooperate with liberal sentiment in England—not in any Pharisaical spirit, but simply because so much is at stake from the standpoint of international friendship and peace.

Another Chance for Peace with Russia

ONCE more there is a chance of peace in Russia. The reactionary General Wrangel has met his richly deserved defeat. The Bolsheviks capitalized their temporary peace with Poland by massing all their forces against Wrangel, but the final victory over him was due not only to the strength of the Bolshevik army, but to the defection of his own troops and to the dissatisfaction of the people he attempted to govern. General Petlura, who has been operating against the autonomous Soviet government of the Ukraine, has also been seriously defeated. Only the bandit Balakovich is left, and at the moment not even the French are pushing him vigorously as the latest in the long line of saviors of Russia.

From every point of view there is only one thing to do and that is to trade with Russia. The defeat of Wrangel will probably end the shilly-shallying of the British government and bring into effect the trade agreement whose terms show how many concessions Lenin will make in order to push his plans for the economic upbuilding of Russia. Other nations will have to follow Britain's lead for selfish reasons. To continue to forbid trade with Russia and to plot against her government will do more to ruin Europe than to defeat the Bolshevik leaders. However great the misery in Russia, it is abundantly clear that the Russians can fight. The conditions of war are favorable to the development of a harsh military dictatorship rather than to the upbuilding of a hopeful communism. As Isaac Don Levine has pointed out, it strengthens the extremists of the Third International rather than the moderates who seek to rebuild industry. Even supposing that by the continuance of war and blockade the Allies make real communism wholly impossible in Russia, they will but have succeeded in canonizing Bolshevism in the minds of masses of workers in every land. It will be idle to point to mistakes in Bolshevik theory or errors in Bolshevik practices so long as the ruthless opposition of the Allies gives to the Soviet government a martyr role. It is abundantly clear that the particular form of Bolshevism in Russia is a product of the absolute collapse of Russian imperialism and capitalism. The continuance of the Allied policy makes not impossible a similar collapse in other countries, and out of that collapse new dictatorships will emerge. The way to constructive progress in Russia and in Europe is the way of peace and trade.

*See the statement of Major General Swinton quoted on page 202 of THE WORLD TOMORROW (July, 1920).

Two Years After

WITHIN the last month the world has celebrated the second anniversary of the signing of the armistice. It was characteristic of the disillusionment of the times that President-elect Harding took occasion on that day to declare explicitly that the United States fought for its national rights and not for democracy. His disclaimer of idealism was at least preferable to an attempt to make it apparent that somehow the war has been idealistic in result.

In the absolute sense, there were no victors in the Great War. Every people emerged from the struggle poorer in material possessions and the things that ennoble the spirit. Relatively the Allies and America won a stupendous victory, but neither their victory nor their peace has brought healing to mankind. This fact is known and read of all men, but the attempt to understand in detail the present world situation is fraught with difficulty. Its problems are tremendously complex. We are too near to the personalities and forces which shape our time to be sure of judging them fairly. Above all, deliberate propaganda by the imperialists and the control of information by the governments which are their tools make it impossible to have the facts on which correct judgments can be formed. In their zeal for propaganda, the statesmen may have fooled themselves. Certainly there has been little evidence of understanding of Russian conditions in high places and it is probably true that the defeat of Venizelos in Greece was as unexpected to the diplomats of the Entente as to the average newspaper reader.

But, in spite of difficulties, we can form certain judgments with reasonable assurance. In the first place, the second anniversary of the armistice saw little abatement in the power of a selfish nationalism or in the ruthless greed of capitalist imperialism. The five great victors in the war were of course the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. Although the United States demanded the least from the conquered powers, she emerged the strongest. She suffered less than her great rivals and profited by their necessities. She has become the great creditor nation. Into her hands fell the largest part of German trade in South America. Her capitalists are intent on further conquests.

Great Britain, in appearance, won the most by the terms of peace. She destroyed the German colonial empire, the German navy, and the German merchant marine. She strengthened her hold on the continents of Asia and Africa; she completed her grip on great trade routes by acquiring virtual mastery in Constantinople and Danzig. Now she

can afford to let the Germans think her merciful in comparison with France. On the whole, her interests are served by restraining the French from too insane an anti-German program on the European continent. But whatever their skill in the diplomacy of imperialism, with the exception of the recent concessions to Egypt, the British rulers have shown no skill in dealing either with the demands of oppressed nationalities or of the working class. Rather, they push the old quest for economic and political advantage throughout the whole world.

In France, the madness of imperialism is most apparent. Large numbers of the French people not unnaturally are still animated by the old fear of Germany. Playing upon that fear, French militarists and imperialists seek by force and by intrigue a mastery over Europe. Their way is the way of ruin. The French demand German indemnities to cover the costs of the war, and at the same time they seek to destroy Germany. By their opposition to union between Germany and Austria, they condemn poor Austria to literal starvation. Powerful groups of French capitalists have made a virtual alliance with the infamous white guard Hungarian government. They have acquired the Hungarian state railroads, and in return they pledged support to the Hungarian policy of reaction, revenge, and anti-semitism, not only in Hungary, but in Czecho-Slovakia and Austria.* It is idle to repeat the history of the French attitude toward Russia. Few things are more instructive than to study the short-sightedness of imperialism as revealed in the French policy. France even less than Britain has been animated by intelligent economic self-interest. If she were, she would have cooperated in building up Germany. There is no economic folly greater than the belief that a man or a nation can prosper in a world of bankrupts. Yet a mixture of vanity, fear, hate, and imperialistic lust urge France ever onward to dreams of empire which she has neither the population nor the financial strength to support. It is the tragedy of a great people who in the hour of their victory have shown no understanding of the principles by which alone happiness and peace can be secured.

From Italy comes light. It is true that Italy is not without her imperialists. Only recently that part of the Tyrol which passed under Italian rule celebrated its annexation by universal mourning. Nevertheless, imperialism is weakening. Though the treaty with Jugo-Slavia gains for Italy territory to which her title is far from clear, she moderated her extreme demands and the negotiations showed some effort toward conciliation. Italy has, more-

*See disclosures printed in THE NATION November 17th.

over, adopted an enlightened policy toward Russia. The Italians, themselves anything but amply provided with food and clothing, have shown a fine hospitality to Austrian children. And, best of all, the Italian workmen, without a civil war, have made greater progress toward a real industrial democracy than the workers of any other land.

Of Japan little needs to be said. There, too, imperialists hold sway, although not utterly without opposition. Japan, like all the victors, is given over to a policy of economic imperialism in which all idealistic professions are set at naught.

The game that the imperialists and the great powers play has its faithful imitators in the lesser nations, notably in Poland and Rumania. It has strengthened the hands of the reactionaries in Germany and delayed the growth of any real spirit of reconciliation. In the end it is doomed to failure. For a more impressive symptom of the times than the fact of imperialism is the disintegration of civilization which proceeds apace. While the imperialists intrigue for economic concessions throughout the world, the credit structure of Europe is tumbling. Millions of people are unfed. Unrest and discontent increase. Even under capitalism a policy of free trade in Europe and the extension of generous credits to German industry would speedily end the famine which takes terrible toll in Central Europe. But it is the fatal weakness of capitalist imperialism that it does not understand the things that belong to its own salvation. While the foundations of their system are undermined, the imperialists scheme and plot and hate each other. So long as the capitalist order seemed to give a reasonable degree of security, masses of men who suffered under it acquiesced in it. The war destroyed that acquiescence. It is gone not merely among the workers of Europe (and to a far less degree of America) but among Asiatics and Africans who have been subject to the far-flung dominance of the white race. China, with all the corruption and inefficiency of her government, is awakening. The revolutionary feeling in India is on the increase. Turks, Tartars, Arabs, Egyptians, the blacks of Africa, are conscious of a new sense of racial solidarity. Meanwhile, the white race itself has already been weakened by the war and is still further threatened by the jealousies of its rival imperialisms. Let no man deceive himself with false hopes. In the economic rivalries which already involve the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan, there are innumerable seeds whose inevitable harvest is new world war. It is only as we can uproot the seeds that we can escape the reaping, and the forces on which we depend are not as strong as could be desired. The disintegration which has followed the war has not spared labor. The socialist movement is divided. A shrewd observer has recently pointed out that at a time when the world waits to know how industry is to be run, science

advanced, and art increased, the Second and Third Internationals are concerned with their own quarrels, and the message of the Third International to the world deals not with these great constructive problems, but with the tactics of acquiring political power; not with the more efficient management of industry and the relief of men from bondage, but with the creation of a centralized control for world revolution. Probably nothing else could have been expected when one considers the absolute ruin from which Russian Bolshevism sprung. But however many are the reasons, those of us who place most confidence in labor must admit that no faction, either of the right or of the left or of the center, has yet displayed the vigor and capacity for constructive building which is the great need of our times. Only in peace is there a chance for building; war keeps alive hatred, and hatred is not constructive. War has almost destroyed man's capacity for keen and constructive thought, for pity, for tolerance, and for brotherhood.

To record these obvious facts is not to express a hopeless pessimism. Sooner or later men will find a way of rebuilding their social life. God grant that it be sooner! Perhaps the old structure of civilization will have to be destroyed as though by fire and then be painfully rebuilt on stronger foundations. Yet none of us can contemplate the human cost of such a process without a passionate longing that chaos and confusion be reduced to the smallest limits. The one hope is in the education of all those who work by hand or brain in the cooperative control of their common riches and the machinery of production. Such control must rest on fellowship rather than coercion. The attainment of this goal will be revolutionary. It need not be catastrophic. Those who would make brotherhood a reality will seek to preserve whatever things are good and true in the rich inheritance from the past. They will realize that the working out of their plans, though it must be rapid, will be gradual rather than instantaneous.

For the achievement of this ideal we are not without hope. There is still the longing in men's hearts for freedom and for fellowship. There is an abundance of technical and administrative skill if it can be enlisted on the right side. There is still a capacity for service and for nobleness. Surely it is permissible at this Christmas time to recall the fact that there was one whom millions of men and women have held as the supreme manifestation of God who long ago in word and in life revealed the spirit in which is our peace. Are we incapable of learning from him whom we have so honored?

It is at once the glory and tragedy of man that in the midst of his mistakes and follies and crimes he has a vision of a better world and of himself not merely as he is but as he might become. If this vision adds to his pain, it adds also to his hope. Surely the time will come when men will not be

content merely to build tombs to the martyrs and prophets whom they have slain, but when they will learn to let their admiration of all those who came,

not to be ministered unto but to minister, lead to imitation of their spirit in the organization of society.

Religion's Entangling Alliances

By HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER

"IRELAND would have been Protestant if England had been Catholic," I said to my friend Donahue. "Yes," he replied, "and they would have been damned good Protestants." What we both meant was that under the strained relations which England and Ireland have bred in their tempestuous intercourse, the two peoples have instinctively carried their spirit of hostility into their ecclesiastical consciousness. They cannot under existing conditions worship God in the same way. So my Irish friend and I agreed that the Church had become a symbol which Irish solidarity needs in order to express itself.

Religion is always organized socially. From the heathen, who, in his blindness, bows down to wood and stone, to the most complex ecclesiastical systems, man has worshiped his divinities in associations, the basis of which has not been theological harmony, but rather some prior grouping, not essentially religious. In other words, a religious system is originally secondary to the group in which it is found. It may develop such power as to have actual priority in consciousness; but even where this seems to be the case, conflict inevitably reestablishes the original relationship in which the group takes precedence over the religion.

As states became articulate, official religion regularly followed. The Holy Roman Empire for a time artificially wielded political power through its ecclesiastical system over most of Europe, but it finally broke into its constituent parts because the states which composed it were psychologically prior to the religious organization. That is, when conflict comes allegiance is given to the state rather than to the religion. When, however, a state is dominated from the outside, it turns to religion as a compensating substitute. In all national groups which have experienced oppression we find solidifying religious organizations, or avowedly anti-religious organizations to which the religious emotion is transferred. We find also that when a subject group develops an anti-ecclesiastical position the dominant group will make a "holy war" by attacking the religious attitude of the subjects. The clerical party of Austria was a political more than a religious organization. The sword of Mohammed was used to extend the territory of the Turk. Cromwell tried to force Protestantism on the Irish, and both the Established Church and the Presbyterians of Ulster now make

their offensive in the name of the "true religion."

In the hands of a national group dominated by another national group, religious institutions become the most powerful means of defense, both as organizations and as symbols of solidarity.

My Irish friend mentioned above appreciated that my remark implied no disparagement of the spiritual earnestness of the Irish, nor any doubt of the genuineness of their devotion to the Church. It meant, on the contrary, that the reality of the Irish question is so deep in the instinctive nature of the group that a substitute has been found which, under the conditions of oppression, offers an object for both the will and the emotion. I have heard an Englishman say that the Irish question is ninety per cent. a Roman Catholic question; I answer that in so far as it has political aspects, it is ninety per cent. English. It is true that there have been Protestants prominently connected with the Irish struggle; nevertheless, the relationship of the Church to the conflict is in the focus of consciousness of both the Irish and the English.

One might question the truth of the above assertion as to the subsidiary character of the ecclesiastical systems in the English-Irish conflict were these same assertions not established by so many other cases. A conspicuous example is that of Bohemia. The Czechs or Bohemians have had an emotional experience of anti-religion quite the equal of the religious experience of the Irish. They were dominated by Catholic Austria, which used the political machinery of the clerical party to make the oppression more effective. The result was that Czech nationalism, being unable to realize itself politically, developed out of its history religious attitudes in opposition to the State and Church—attitudes which symbolized the group consciousness and gave it such solidarity as it could hardly have secured otherwise. As the Irish dominated by Protestant England became most devout Catholics, so the Czechs dominated by Catholic Austria became militant "freethinkers."

Some years ago, when I began to study the problem of the adjustment of the Czechs to American life, I found that I could not account for the most outstanding phenomena of any Czech community without knowing five hundred years of Czech history. John Hus, who was burned at the stake in 1415, was and still is the most vital personality in

Czech life. He was a priest, a religious reformer, and a patriot. He was condemned to death, and executed by a combination of the Church and the State. The State forthwith undertook to suppress both the people and the religious movement which grew out of the influence of Hus and his manner of death. The Hussite wars resulting in national independence followed, and Bohemia was Protestant and "heretic" a full century before Luther. In 1620, early in the Thirty Years' War, she was defeated and became part of the Austrian Empire, her rights being progressively restricted down to the Great War. From 1620 to 1781 no religion except the Roman Catholic was permitted in Austria. In the latter year, the Act of Toleration granted to the people the choice of their church, and a Reformed Church consequently came into being. But it never secured over three per cent. of the people because it, too, represented state sanction. Since freethinking organizations as such were prohibited in Austria, the national aspirations were expressed in organizations such as the Sokols or gymnastic societies, which were actually anti-religious but nominally neutral as to religion.

In America, however, to which the Czechs began to come after the revolution of 1848, anti-religion, potential in Europe, became articulate through the organization of openly freethinking societies of various sorts whose philosophy appropriated a combination of Tom Paine, Robert Ingersoll, and Darwin incorporated into the atmosphere of historic tradition. Approximately two-thirds of the Czechs in the United States either actually belong to freethinking organizations or have such a nominal relation to the Church that it has ceased to exert any control over them.

The anti-religious attitude was definitely militant, and developed many aids in the conflict—a distinctive literature, newspapers, "schools for teaching the Bohemian language and the principle of free-thought," Sokols, or gymnastic societies which proclaim that they preclude religious and political questions, insurance fraternities. All of these were actively engaged in the fight against religion. Most of the intellectuals, and many of the common workmen, make a religion of their antipathy to religion. The Protestant Church has made very little headway with them. They feel that Protestantism is only part of the truth. The result is a peculiar combination of materialism and idealism. The philosophy at the bottom of the freethinking movements leads naturally to materialism, but the people who normally embraced it did so not because of its philosophy, but because their ideal was the freedom of Bohemia. This is shown by the fact that in almost all cases the real motive around which the freethinkers rallied was nationalistic. In every city where there are sufficient numbers, the freethinkers have their organizations in the "national hall." Their

literature and their conscious aim has been the emancipation of Bohemia. The Catholics have not been altogether lacking in this feeling of nationality, but generally it has come out of their inconsistency rather than out of their organized purpose. A Catholic said to me, "as a Catholic, I do not approve of Hus; but as a Bohemian, I admire him." The whole freethinking movement was not philosophical or theological but nationalistic, though even men of meager intellectual opportunities can give the rational basis for their atheism. The dominance of the patriotic impulse in them came out most clearly when religious hatreds militated against the advantage of the nation. I had long been familiar with the bitterness of the controversy between Catholic and freethinker; it was hard to imagine any cooperation possible until generations should have passed away. Early in the war the Bohemian National Alliance, composed entirely of freethinkers, began its active support of propaganda for Bohemian freedom. There were strong patriots among the Catholics, who spoke with defiance of the political policies of clericalized Vienna. But the possibility of their cooperation with the anti-church group was unthinkable.

In December, 1917, we declared war against Austria-Hungary, and immediately the impossible happened. At a mass meeting in Cleveland a few days after the declaration of war, the speakers were freethinkers, Priests, and socialists. There was but one note in the addresses—Czechoslovak freedom. Soon the Czechoslovak National Council was formed, uniting all factions. From this time on they worked together. During the winter, when money was being raised for the Czechoslovak army, house to house solicitation was made by a freethinker in company with a Catholic. In Cleveland, the Bohemian Red Cross met on alternate weeks at the National Hall and the parochial school, whereas a year before no self-respecting member of either would have set foot inside the building of the other. What has happened in the new Republic of Czechoslovakia is even more significant. Although open anti-religion had been impossible, for twenty years the intellectuals had been drifting away from the Church, while among the working men socialism had been furnishing an anti-religious rallying ground. There had been no open revolt, and the clerical party held the balance of power and took its orders from Vienna. No sooner had independence been assured than the forces that had been restrained broke forth. There were demands for fundamental reforms in the Church, including a retrial of John Hus; in January, 1920, an actual schism took place with the establishment of the Czechoslovak Church. The freethinking movement, then, must be thought of as a religious movement having, in spite of its philosophy, the earmarks of religious devotion. It was adequate to absorb the

emotions and at the same time to serve as a symbol of national aspirations, which had been crushed by hopeless political conditions; for, since the Church was identified with the hated government, anti-religion was a direct attack on the government and thus served as an outlet for national feeling.

In striking contrast to the Bohemians are their cousins, the Poles, who live in adjoining territory. Without going into any details of Polish history, it is enough to say that when the Kingdom of Poland was divided the two largest portions went to Germany and Russia. These two countries in quite characteristic ways tried to assimilate the Poles. It so happened that in religion Prussia was Protestant and Russia Greek Orthodox. The Poles had been indifferent Catholics up to that time but became most ardently devout as soon as their Church became a symbol around which to rally in opposition to the dominating governments. As the governments increased their methods of coercion, so the Church increased its machinery of unity. This unity was accomplished partly through educational agencies, partly through economic organizations,—as in German Poland,—and always through furnishing a basis for political organization. The Pole recognizes the intimate relation between his religion and nationality. A Polish peasant wrote: "Parents, the time approaches when your children must go to school, and not to a Polish one but to the Prussians—which is very dangerous for you, Poles, Catholics, since it is generally known that Germanization leads to Lutherization. Therefore, if you bring up your children in the mother tongue, in ancient Polish customs, you may be sure that they will grow into men acceptable to God, the Church, and the Polish nation, and will not end their lives in prison or under the ax of an executioner, as so often happened recently in Upper Silesia."*

Before the inroads of socialism the Poles were practically all Roman Catholics. In Warsaw the only Protestant Churches were German, and in Cracow there were none. General Ludendorff in his story of the war said that the clergy were the pillars of Polish national propaganda, and he could not understand why they were allowed under Russian rule to make their religion the bulwark of their nationality.

The *mores* of our time would not allow Russia and Germany to forbid religion as Austria forbade irreligion. In the case of Poles who came to America, the condition of freedom here did not call for a break with the Church as in the case with the Bohemians. So here, as in Europe, they continued to symbolize their nationalism by their devotion to the Church just as the Irish have done.

Dogma is supplemented by ritual in order to make the identity of the group recognizable and solid.

*"The Polish Peasant," Thomas and Znaniecki.

Both of these are rigid and conspicuous under conditions of oppression when the group is in danger.

This is perhaps best illustrated in the history of the Jews. The partition of Poland was as nothing compared to the denationalizing wanderings of the Jews, against whom there have been varied but continuous discriminations. Whatever the origin of the discrimination, whether racial, religious, or economic, the fact remains that the symbol of antagonism for two thousand years has been religion. There has been a constant effort to exterminate the Jew. This would have succeeded if it had not been for the solidarity of the group maintained through dogma and ritual. The religious teachings unquestionably had a salutary effect on character, but that alone would not have been sufficient to preserve the Jews. There were needed immediately obvious signs by which the group could recognize itself. These were furnished by ritual. Everywhere the Jews have been subject to alien governments which generally discriminated against them and made it impossible for them to have a central controlling body like the hierarchy of Rome. Therefore the Synagogue had to permit local autonomy in religious and social life from the very necessity of the situation.

As the separation became more definite and the danger of extermination under oppression more imminent, the devotion to ancient symbols became more intense. The Bible, which preceded most of their wanderings, and the rabbinical interpretations in the Talmud, furnished the basis for dogmatic and ritualistic unity. It is a unique and marvelous fact that the Jewish groups scattered over the face of the earth with practically no intercommunication for centuries have maintained both their existence and their consciousness of solidarity. They have usually come to partake of some of the characteristics of the people among whom they have lived, but they have retained identity of form and purpose. This would have been impossible except for the Synagogue.

In England, France, and the United States, countries where in modern times anti-Semitism has been growing less acute, there has been a corresponding diminution of Jewish dogma and ritual. This has been in part due, of course, to the broader intellectual outlook of modern times. But it may be made as a general statement, that wherever the Jews are oppressed as a people there the Synagogue will be strong and even though it may be emancipated from many of its unessential forms, it will still fail to merge into the general religious community if anywhere in the world there is discrimination against the Jew. Hidden away in this religious unity was the potential nationalism which is now emerging in the form of Zionism wherever in the world the Jew is found. The Zionist movement, which seeks to establish the Jewish nation,

has many intellectual leaders who are entirely emancipated from the Synagogue; but it is nevertheless true that the more orthodox have been the more enthusiastic Zionists, and the more liberal have come more tardily or not at all to the separate nation idea because they have so much more completely ceased to think of themselves as a group apart.

The process of denationalization was involved in the becoming liberal, but neither could take place until conditions of freedom prevailed. When it is no longer necessary for the oppressed group to hold together for its very existence, the significance of particular group symbols diminishes. At the present moment there are renewed difficulties to Jewish existence in Europe, so that Jews in America feel themselves stirred by a vicarious unity which is derived from the common history of religious and social experience. Even the most liberal congregations are tending to bring back some of the ritual which had been discarded. The Sabbath, prayers, food laws, festivals, make it impossible for the Jew to forget himself. Churches, pictures, beads, priests, fasts, and fears serve the same purpose for the devout Catholic. The freethinking Czech, on the other hand, consciously emphasizes his identity with his group by rejecting this sort of thing. His ritual becomes opposition to the ritual which reminds him of his old bondage. In secret fraternities among the freethinkers, the ritual is reduced to a minimum to allay memories of the Church. Forms and regalia, likewise suggestive of the church atmosphere, are dropped. A dealer in flags and regalia among all the Slavs said that the Czechs used less than any other Slavs, his explanation being that ceremonial regalia suggested the Church and therefore had been rejected. The church building is peculiarly hateful.

The extent to which this antipathy to the Church structure itself may be carried was demonstrated in Chicago, when a Czech Protestant pastor of that city invited me to speak on the birthday anniversary of the Czech educator Comenius. The meeting was to be held in a church. The notice was offered to the daily papers of both the freethinkers and the socialists, but neither would print it because of the place of meeting. These papers never—even for money—advertised anything connected with a church, whether Catholic or Protestant. Later I was asked to repeat the lecture in the auditorium of a high school; both papers advertised it, and my audience was much larger than that previously assembled in the building dedicated to religious worship. In his campaign in Chicago in 1912 President Taft innocently spoke in the Czech district in a hall belonging to a church. The Republican Czech press throughout the country raised a storm of indignation and Taft lost thousands of votes.

A further significant illustration of my thesis is the relation of religion to the proletarian movement or class conflict, which is avowedly economic. The socialist has more or less secured the reputation of being anti-religious. On the other hand, the Catholic Church officially and the Protestant Church rather generally have been anti-socialist. The socialists have attributed this attitude on the part of the Church to the fact that the Church, being allied with capital, is forced to fight socialism. There is an element of truth in this contention, but it is also true that the socialists began the attack on the Church, thus putting the Church on the defensive. The socialistic attitude toward religion is exactly the same as that of an oppressed nation. The capitalistic system which it is directly attacking stands in the place of the oppressing nation and constantly threatens to disintegrate the group that is fighting it. In Europe, where socialism, like many other movements, had its birth, the state church prevailed. An attack on the Church furnished an immediate possibility symbolizing the whole conflict and therefore making for a better solidarity. Most socialists have transferred their religious emotions to socialism—some with as little understanding of its tenets as they had formerly possessed with respect to the tenets of their religion; others with the intellectual insight of theologians and the fervor of religious fanatics. Socialism, which is based on economic theory, and freethinking, which is based on metaphysics, are both largely subterfuges for a frustrated group will, rather than the organized sequence of their logical premises.

Examples of the working of this relation of religion to the group are conspicuously present in every country where oppression has obtained. In Finland the Swedes converted the people to the Lutheran Church. The leading church in Helsingfors has alternate services in Swedish and Finnish. There has never been any open religious conflict, but during the last twenty-five years a great proportion of the Finns have become socialists. This can be accounted for in part by the theory that socialism furnished an opposition movement to the dominant church and thereby to the dominant nationality.

Another Slavonic nation which has suffered from oppression is Croatia, which has lived under Hungary. The Croats speak practically the same language as the Serbians, with whom they are in geographical proximity. But the Serbs are all Orthodox and the Croats Roman Catholics. They now have joined in an effort to form a single state. The traditional religious antagonisms increased the difficulty, but there is every indication that they will be subordinated, and a Yugoslav (South Slav) state created. The well known democracy of the Finns would not have involved irreligion if irreligion had not been a form of resistance to the Swedes as a group.

South of Finland are the Letts and the Lithuanians, who ethnologically belong together, but have been dominated by different nations. The Letts have been dominated politically by Russia and culturally and economically by Germans. The bitterness of feeling against the German landlord class is registered in religious reaction. As a recent writer has said:

"Since the reformation all power in matters ecclesiastical has rested with the nobles, who have strenuously resisted any attempt to introduce beside the Lutheran Church any more independent form of Protestantism. The pastors were almost all German. Many of them were admirable men. They did much to preserve and systematize the Lett and Esth languages; but they lived in fine parsonages, in comfort inferior only to the castles of the Barons; they held rich glebe lands, on which the peasantry was compelled to work without remuneration because the pastor's income was dependent on the glebe; before the abolition of serfage they owned serfs. As a class they were more conservative than the barons and have been slower to realize the passing of the patriarchal age. On the Lett proletariat in the towns and villages they have now scarcely any influence at all. . . . Protestantism as a social and political factor in northeast Europe has practically ceased to exist." *

It has "ceased to exist," let us say, as conventional Protestantism, but it continues to exist as an articulate opposition to the old state church. It is not without significance that the Letts were the first people to make peace with the Soviets of Russia, which have been consistently opposed to nationalistic domination affiliated with religious institutions.

The Lithuanians have had a similar experience but with somewhat different results. Politically under the Russians, like the Letts, they have been culturally under the Poles, who are Roman Catholics. All the Lithuanians became Catholic under Polish influence, but when they began to get nationally conscious the first opposition was directed against the Poles rather than against the Russians. This brought an immediate change in religious attitudes. Even the Church became nationalistic and broke away from the Poles, who had nurtured it. The two significant developments, however, were those of the freethinkers and the socialists. The former developed best in America, where they became very strong as a propaganda agency both against the Catholic Church and in behalf of Lithuanian nationality. When the recent national crisis came, however, they did exactly the same thing as the Czechs; namely, freethinking, nationalistic, and Catholic organizations united to form the Lithuanian National Council. The socialists, who have

considerable numbers and a good deal of influence, would not cooperate with the Council on account of the international doctrines of socialism, but in spite of that they are quite as conscious of their nationality as are the others.

On the other side of Poland are the Ukrainians of Galicia, whose territory became a part of Austria some three hundred years ago. At that time they were all members of the Orthodox Church, like the part of Russia from which they came. At first an effort was made to proselyte them to the Roman Catholic Church, but with no success. A compromise was made by which they were enabled to keep their Orthodox rite while acknowledging the authority of the Pope. They were called Uniates (one with Rome) or Greek Catholics to distinguish them from Greek Orthodox or Roman Catholics. They have a married clergy and the service in Old Slavonic. An outsider cannot tell the difference between the Uniate and Orthodox service; nor could the participants tell, except for continual emphasis. In order that they might not be constantly thinking of their relationship to Russia their attention was deliberately focused on their religious differences until religion became practically equivalent to a nationality to them. This was made easier in the case of the Ukrainians by the presence of the Poles among them. The Poles were generally the land owners; were, also, Roman Catholics. They exercised the cultural control, while Austria had political control. It was of peculiar advantage to Austria, in maintaining her dominance, to play on every possible antagonism in order to keep her subjects from uniting against her. This antagonism, finally developed against Russia, was so great that in the early years of the World War the Ukrainians were the only Slavs who were pro-German. They were also unusually religious. Their official newspapers were most violently anti-Russian. With the emergence of the possibility of a Ukrainian state, however, a sudden change took place. A strong anti-German attitude was developed and orthodoxy ceased to be hateful. The change reached across the seas, for two Uniate Churches in Cleveland immediately became Orthodox; and the tendency to leave Rome and identify the Church with the new state is likely to continue. The intense bitterness of feeling against the Poles made a relationship to the same church authority, even with marked freedom, undendurable.

In Albania there have been three major religions: Moslem, Greek Orthodox, and Roman Catholic. They have always fought one another. During the Peace Conference three hundred Moslem Albanians in Pittsburgh telegraphed their representative in Washington that if it would have any influence for the freedom of their country on the Peace Conference in Paris they would become Christians. The three religious groups are united

*"The New Europe," Butler, 1919.

in America in the cause of national freedom in Europe.

Just as the Roman Catholics divided on national lines in the Great War so the Moslems divided on the same lines and did not respond to the call of the Sultan for a "Holy War." In India they have even joined with their age-long enemies the Hindus. It is generally felt that England has promoted the religious antagonisms between these religions in order to prevent them from being able to oppose their combined forces against their rulers. A few years ago it might have been dogmatically said that they would never get together, but that they have actually done so is shown by the following quotation from the speech of the president of the All India Congress on the 27th of December, 1919:

"Besides the attempt to terrorize the people, the Punjab officials aimed a blow at the most valuable asset of our political life, the union between Hindus and Mohammedans. You are aware, fellow delegates, of the prophetic scene of fraternization between Hindus and Muslims which took place during the recent disturbance at Delhi, Lahore, and other places, accompanied with shouts of '*Hindu Musliman ki jai*.' These expressions of fellowship in a common trouble were treated by the Punjab officials as heinous crimes amounting to open rebellion and waging war against the king, and a new offense was created which was defined as 'fraternization of Hindus and Mohammedans by law established.' One of the most shameful acts of the Martial Law authorities was to ridicule the Hindu-Muslim entente publicly in various ways. The admission of Hindus to the Mohammedan mosques and of Mohammedans to the Hindu temples, the drinking of water or sherbet from the same glass by Hindu and Mohammedan, were unmistakable signs of a far deeper union of the two than could be looked upon with equanimity by those who were interested in keeping them apart. And an attempt was made under official inspiration during the closing days of Martial Law to found separate political associations or *Sabhas* for Hindus, Mohammedans, and Sikhs; I do not know what progress has been made in this direction, but I trust that my fellow countrymen of all communities will refrain from swallowing this fatal bait."

What effect this new development will have on Christianity cannot be foretold, but its probability is indicated by the remark of an educated Hindu to a missionary who asked him what he thought of Jesus. He said, "I revere and honor Him, but He suffers the handicap of association with the West." The student of world affairs who is inclined to explore for a hint of prophecy in this Hindu's judgment can readily discern that if the missionaries take the side of England there is grave danger that their whole work will be thrust out. Even if there should be no attack on the missionary

work itself, the fact that it is promoted by a religion accepted by England may be a liability greater than it can bear. Recently at a conference of students of various nationalities at an American college, one of the meetings was being held in a church building. A Hindu graduate student, representing one of our great universities, on seeing where the meeting was to take place stopped short and exclaimed: "I am not going into one of those Christian temples!"

In Korea we have one of the most unusual religious situations that can be found. The Kingdom was opened to the world in 1882; in 1884 the first Christian missionaries went into the country. In four thousand years Korea had never developed any national religion, and probably had fewer temples than any other country with so long a history. Consequently, there was not the conscious resistance to the missionaries that is generally found. Hostility to Japan has long been active in Korea, but it did not become intense until 1910, when Japan annexed the Kingdom and tried to assimilate the people by methods similar to those practiced by European powers. The missionaries remained neutral, but as Christianity furnished a proper symbol for the Independence Movement, the leaders of the movement are as devout Methodists and Presbyterians as the leaders of the Irish are devout Catholics. The religious situation is clearly shown by the statistics in the *Congressional Record*, Sept. 19, 1919, as follows:

"The Christians have 3,164 churches, the Buddhists 258, and the Shinto 65. There are 6,690 Christian ministers, 313 Buddhist priests, and 103 Shinto priests."

No such phenomenal progress could have been made in less than thirty years had there not been need under the political conditions for just such a symbolization as Christianity furnished.

Illustrations enough have been given to show that in the struggles for freedom ecclesiastical systems become the handmaidens of purposes outside themselves. Religion can emerge pure and undefiled by entangling alliances with political and economic group conflict only under a condition of freedom and democracy as yet but vaguely glimpsed in dreams. When it comes, the test of religion will be psychological and moral, not patriotic and expedient. It is to the difficult task of attaining this freedom, and the consequent purifying of religion, that the best efforts of men and women of vision must be bent.

AT long last all conscientious objectors are free. We congratulate them on their release less than we do the nation which possesses men of such strength of purpose. Their long confinement was almost as great a blot upon our so-called democracy as upon the record of Messrs. Wilson and Baker.

The Great Lunacy

By AN EYE-WITNESS

MANY moons hence, it is said, the learned will gather into a Book called Blue their weighty conclusions as to that strange disposal of skyey circumstances which gave rise in Everland to the disorder known as The Great Lunacy. But I am unlettered in such high matters, and can here set forth only the account of a plain man who by the mercy of God both escaped the general contagion and lived to tell the tale.

The lunacy, as all know, is no new sickness in Everland. But there is no record of any seizure approaching, in majesty of disaster, to The Great Lunacy. The malady burst like a thunderclap on almost every part of the continent of Everland at once, and spread with the rapidity of a pestilence. It not only infected vast areas of Everland at one and the same time, but it traversed seas and even oceans and attacked in like manner the inhabitants of other lands.

Nevertheless, at the first, and despite the unequalled havoc wrought by the disease on the minds of men, there remained (since Everland is a great continent) uninfected areas. I myself lived in such an one, and, being much engaged in solitude about my own business, I supposed that in time the physicians would find means to allay the pitiful scourge, and bring relief and peradventure recovery to the greater part of the persons afflicted. That I was in error concerning this matter I learned from my own physician, who had been of old also my friend. Walking alone one day and pondering my business, I rejoiced to see him come towards me eagerly, with bright eyes and the springing gait of health. But as soon as he spoke my mind was sorely perplexed.

"Blood!" he repeated many times with an infinite relish. "*Blood!* To let blood was of old time held to be the salvation of man, and is it not therefore in accord with reason that it shall also be the salvation of an Everland too long nursed on the loathsome lap of luxury, and the foundation of a virile race?" Together with much more of the same wild nature, so that at the last I was fain to see that my friend was smitten with the lunacy, and to set about the sorrowful task of placing him in the hands of a brother physician.

And thereby I was brought to a better understanding of the grave peril of Everland, for I could find no physician who was himself free of the disorder.

"The whole duty of the physician," expounded one, "is to recover of their wounds those who, being recovered, will thereupon be able again to stay the

course of projectiles after the one rightful manner; to wit, with the trained and lusty and exceeding beautiful body of youth. Hinder me not with idle prate of your friend—who, moreover, if I mistake not, is beyond the age of two score years and one."

Thus with grief I understood that for him, too, there was no hope, inasmuch as this was one of the many signs of The Great Lunacy. For some reason comprehended only of themselves the lunatics held that a greater zeal in the profession and practice of lunacy was to be demanded of persons below the age of two score years and one than of those above it. And it is in large measure to the circumstance that the length of my days upon earth had reached two score years and two that I owe my life. For in those earlier days of the lunacy it was still sufficient for a man's safety that he should have passed this perilous age, and that he should speak of nothing overmuch and of the lunacy itself not at all.

But as the malady increased in violence and the number of afflicted multiplied, this was no longer so. In previous visitations of the lunacy, as I understand, there had ever remained a sufficient company of the sane to testify openly to the continued existence of sanity. But as The Great Lunacy swept over the land, gathering more and more millions into the pit of destruction, sanity little by little all but ceased to exist. For, by a stroke of that cunning common to the complaint of lunacy, it had been decreed by those in lunatic authority that all under the prescribed age should wear dress set apart for them, and that if any who wore this dress still professed or called themselves sane, the penalty thereof should be death; whereby great numbers of the young, who were best fitted to resist the onslaughts of the disease, were constrained to notify themselves as insane and live accordingly. So that at the last, the disease having by these and other means become well-nigh universal, lunacy came to be regarded as the only sanity; and of those few women and older men who had escaped the contagion and remained sane, the greater part found it politic to profess the general lunacy (thus ere long drawing upon themselves in very deed the evil they professed), while the few who continued, to the public inconvenience and anger, to affirm their sanity, were confined as lunatics in the asylums or as criminals in the common jails of the land.

Now it came to pass that when The Great Lunacy had raged for many years, I, too (albeit I lived a quiet and retired life), found that I was under suspicion of that sanity which to the lunatics was lunacy. And on a day, debating this matter in my

mind, I paced a market-place where the lunatics, after the manner of their kind, were congregated with uncouth gestures and meaningless songs, and with much empty clamor and idiot laughter. And a great sadness fell upon me, inasmuch as I saw that I must shortly be banded with such as these, mousing foolishness and vain imagings, or else must needs lie until the end of the lunacy as a common malefactor in a noisome jail.

But thereupon, as I passed a booth whereon was displayed a great variety of the lunatics' wild and windy writings, a man plucked me by the sleeve and said in my ear, "You are sane."

Now it seemed to me that the hour of my painful choice was come upon me; but whereas in my mind I had been almost persuaded that it would be better to subscribe to the tenets of lunacy and so walk free, there arose at this instant a stubbornness in my soul that laid its commands upon my tongue. "Even so, sir," I made answer, therefore. "Lead you on to the jail, and I will follow with no unseemly brawling."

But to my great amaze the man looked at me as though he could find it in his heart to love me, and bending yet nearer he murmured, "Well and bravely spoken. Nevertheless, have no fear, for I am even as you. Come at the hour of midnight to the street called, ere the lunacy, 'Free Speech,' and there in a house once well named 'Liberty' you shall meet your fellows."

And it befell even as he had said, and of that small company assembled the man with whom I had had speech was, by virtue of many and great gifts, the leader. Moreover, before the lunacy, he had been held in much honor of all men, by reason of his manifold services not only to the state of Everland, but to the poor and oppressed even to the ends of the earth. But now he was hunted for the offense of sanity, and a price set upon his head.

And first, therefore, he would have us make search of the house, lest haply there should be any lying in wait for him. But finding no man, we sat down in peace, and the leader spoke many goodly words of wisdom, the like of which had not blessed my understanding since the days before the lunacy. And thereat I felt a high enfranchisement of the spirit, and my fear and anger concerning the evils of the lunacy was turned to a swelling power of compassion for the lunatics. For the substance of his words moved me mightily, as though a silver trumpet from heaven had sounded in the room. And he said that the continent of Everland, being now very far gone in the lunacy, could no longer be saved by the open ministrations of the few remaining sane persons, but that nevertheless it behooved us, who by the measureless mercy of God were yet in possession of our understandings, to administer in all such ways as might prove convenient the sovereign remedy whereof we held the

secret. Whereat I, being new to the assembly, made bold to enquire of him its name. And he, speaking with a light upon his countenance such as I never saw in any other man, made answer, "Sir, the name thereof is Truth."

At this there arose a strange scuffling and scrambling sound whereat for a moment we all marveled, and then there appeared on the hearth-place the sooty form of a young child whom the lunatics had concealed in the chimney to spy upon our assembly. And he, running to the door, began to cry out lustily, "Here be lunatics! Here be lunatics!"

But when some of the company, deeming that all was on the point to be lost, would have restrained the child and held him by force, the leader said, "It boots not. Let him go." Therefore they let him go, perceiving that the leader had a plan.

And the child ran into the street repeating his cry, "Here be lunatics!" so that the people came running in a great company, and we were like to be set upon and killed. But the guardians of the lunatic law, coming up at that instant, scattered the multitude with blows, saying that all these things, even to the killing of lunatics, must be done decently and in order.

So they sent for certain of the rulers of the lunatics, and when these were come they examined us straitly, and also took the evidence of the young child, and all with much ceremony and many sounding words, as is the pleasure of lunatics. Then for a space they departed to consider of our sentence, and I prepared my soul, as well as I might, for death. But the leader sat apart, careless of death, musing upon the lunatics, and smiling as a strong man, beaten by the puny hands of his angry child, may smile in love and forbearance.

And when the rulers returned, it was plain to us that they were in good odor with themselves, and their spokesman delivered to us their verdict thus:

"Be it known unto you, lunatics, that by the great law of this most sane continent of Everland, you are every one guilty of sedition and treason, whereof the penalty is that you suffer the utmost rigor of the law. But having regard to the love of liberty, clemency, and civilization that has in all ages flamed like a torch in Everland, and most of all in these days of the new sanity, we are resolved not to visit you with the just and reasonable sentence of death. There shall be no sentence passed upon any man among you save this only: that from twelve hours hence this great continent of Everland in its entirety shall be to you an area prohibited, wherein if you be found you die; and that no man, under pain of death, shall furnish you with any ship, boat, raft or other sea-going vessel wherein to depart from Everland."

Then was my heart heavy within me, for what was this, I thought, save lunatic sentence of death?

But our leader, rising up and speaking (of his

gentleness towards them) with a high gravity such as all their souls loved, made answer: "Ruling sirs, you have spoken. We have heard. It is well."

Then one of the lunatics, unable longer to conceal his joy of their cunning strategy, cried out: "But what will you do, lunatics? What will you do?"

And our leader, answering after the same manner as before, said: "Sir, if our works be good, shall not God deliver us? And if they be evil, shall we not justly return to our father the devil?"

Whereat all the lunatics, forgetful of their dignity, pranced and capered and clapped their hands, for they held that now we were condemned out of our own mouths, and that when they killed us men would say, "Here is proof that their works were evil. For if not, did they not say that God would deliver them?"

So they made a way for us, and our leader, going before, led us to his own house, in which he had dwelt until such time as the price was set upon his head. And the lunatics, well content, put a strong guard about the house; and a great concourse of the people thronged the street, waiting to see how we should be killed in due season.

Now it so chanced that the leader's house was built upon the banks of the river that flowed through that city; and he, taking us into the bowels of the earth where the foundations of the house were laid, discovered unto us a water-gate, and a dark passage adjacent thereto, the which of old time had led to a certain pleasant bathing-place upon the river's brim, now become a wharf. The passage was fallen into disuse and decay, so that it seemed to us the darkness led nowhither, or peradventure to destruction. Nevertheless, we followed hard after him, for he was our leader. And at the last he came to another door, the which he opened, and we saw at our feet an ancient wooden dam built to hold off the waters of the river from the passageway, and ahead a light, and ships upon the river, and a wharf, and bales of merchandise thereon. The wharf was inhabited by no man save only a watchman. And he, being infirm with age, neither saw nor heard us as we went out privily, by one's and by two's, upon the ancient wooden dam to the quay, and thence into a by-street.

And as we passed from the dam out upon the quay, beneath the stars and into the blessed air of heaven, my heart was glad. "Now will they believe that thou art from God," I said in the leader's ear, "when they perceive that He hath delivered us."

But he, shaking his head and smiling (yet with eyes that were tender for his persecutors), pointed to where the weight of our passing had made a small breach in the wooden dam, the which in that place was exceeding crumbled with age. And I saw that water trickled through it, and that the river would presently burst its borders, flooding the passage and undermining the house. "What should

they think," he made answer, "save that their pitiless god has indeed destroyed us as by water, and carried our dead bodies out to sea? For how should a man make his God save in his own image?"

So we passed from thence, journeying unceasingly through the night. And with the dawn there arose mountains before us, and in the mountains caves. And there, in a certain cave well hidden, we found the rest of our company, all safely adventured through the night, together with such store of food and a great press for the preparation of the simples of Truth as the leader had prepared against this day.

And there we lived and labored many months, husbanding our stores with all carefulness (for who could say when the lunacy would be abated?). And there we prepared our remedies of Truth by day, and went forth secretly by night to dispose of them in such places as seemed convenient, if by chance we might bring back sanity to some few of the more lightly afflicted among the inhabitants of Everland. But our leader we would not suffer to go forth from among us, for there was peril, and some who set forth we saw no more, and without him we and the work had been lost or at the least woefully hindered. Yet because he thus yielded to our entreaty, he labored the more within the cave, as if he had been ten men, so that at the last, by reason of long labor and little meat and, above all, the sickness of hope deferred, his bodily strength departed from him, and he died.

And while we yet mourned over him in a deep anguish without speech, two who had lately gone forth from among us returned saying that at last the simples had so far wrought on the minds of a great number of the people that the lunacy was like ere long to be abated. And in this manner it befell that the good for which we had so much labored seemed to us in that moment but a small thing by comparison with the greatness of our loss.

Yet it was even as they said, so that in a little while we could safely go forth from the cave by day, and mingle with the people, none inquiring of our age or demanding to see our writ of lunacy.

So it came to pass that on a certain day I returned to that market-place where first I had heard the leader's voice, for in my longing after him who was gone I desired for a space to add sorrow to sorrow by joining remembrance to loss. And, as before, the people thronged the market-place, but now the light of health was again in their eyes, and all were restored to sanity. Yet there was not one among them who had aught of the mien or the natural majesty of him who was dead.

And as I looked about me, considering this strange thing—that the greater must ever needs die for the less—there was a movement of the populace towards a certain spot where a monument rose on high, but shrouded in a great cloth. Then,

too, of a sudden music filled the market-place and there came a procession with bright banners, and the multitude gave out a sounding noise, and one in authority having a gold chain about his neck rose up and spoke many fair words concerning the deliverer of Everland from The Great Lunacy. And they put aside the cloth from the monument and a mighty figure in fine marble shone forth. And I was as one who dreamed, for I beheld the form of the leader. Moreover, the graver had so well

wrought that the face was indeed his face, even to the light thereon that was not the light of the sun.

So, after all these things were done, the great company of the people went away to dance and feast and make merry in the leader's honor for the space of one whole day.

But my eyes were blinded that I could not see. For, despite the statue and the honor and the glory, he was dead. Nor did any in that place consider that but for them he had been still alive.

A Study in Intrigue

NEWSPAPER headlines have brought home the tangled condition of Near Eastern affairs. Venizelos has been defeated in Greece. Turkish Nationalists are advancing against Georgia and may have seized its port, Batum. On November 7th they concluded an armistice with Armenia which practically leaves that country at their mercy; since then Armenians have been obliged to evacuate Erivan, their capital city, before the advance of the Tartars of Azerbaijan. The Russians are allied with the Turkish nationalists. President Wilson has formally defined the frontiers of Armenia, but it is doubtful whether the Turks will pay any attention to his definition. Such, in brief, is the news as the papers record it. To piece these tangled bits into a consistent picture is an absorbing puzzle problem. For those who would understand the intrigues of imperialism it must be attempted.

It will be recalled that during the war the Allies professed a desire for the liberation of oppressed peoples under the Turks. At the same time, both Premier Lloyd George and President Wilson explicitly guaranteed Turkish sovereignty in the districts in which the Turks were predominant. Meanwhile, during the war, secret treaties were made entirely inconsistent with these pledges. At the peace conference the secret treaties outweighed the public pledge. From the moment the armistice was signed began a mad race for the economic and political power in which British, French, Greeks, and Italians joined. It has suited Lloyd George's convenience to express grief that the United States did not take a mandate for the whole of the old Turkish Empire north of Syria and Mesopotamia. Actually, neither France nor Britain desired anything of the sort. When the American Colonel Haskell was in Georgia as a representative of the Allies, French emissaries openly intrigued against him and plotted for power and concessions. All that was finally offered to the United States was a mandate over what used to be Russian Armenia. This hapless little country was surrounded by intriguing powers. Any troops we might send would

be cut off from direct communication with the United States and we would be involved in an almost hopeless set of intrigues. How little either the French or the British government cared for the Armenians is illustrated by such facts as these: The French first used the Armenians in Cilicia to fight for them against the Turks. When the Turkish nationalist opposition became too strong the French withdrew, leaving the disarmed Armenians to their fate. On the other hand, the present weakness of Armenia in the face of her foes is due very largely to the British. They stripped her fortresses of artillery in order to strengthen Denikin—who, by the way, always asserted the Russian claim to its old Caucasian provinces. They promised later to return this artillery if it was needed. They never kept their promise, but only sent an inadequate supply of small arms for which friends of Armenia paid. Meanwhile, the artillery they sent to Denikin fell into the hands of the Bolsheviks who are now allied more or less with the Turkish nationalists! And Italians sold arms to the Turks. British interests did Armenia another ill turn. They informed the Tartars of Azerbaijan of the mineral wealth of Karabakh—a district claimed both by Armenia and Azerbaijan—and offered a price for the right to exploit it. It is a desire to collect this and to control the cotton lands of the Arax valley rather than love for the Turks which has stimulated the present Tartar war upon Armenia.

We have thus as the first thing to be remembered the intrigues of the Great Powers which made impossible any disinterested system of mandates or peace between rival races of the old Turkish Empire. These intrigues have found temporary solution in the agreement between France, Italy, and England, defining their respective spheres of influence, political and economic. It will be recalled that this agreement is precisely of the same nature as the Algeciras pact regarding the exploitation of Morocco which was one of the direct roots of the Great War.

But the Great Powers were not the only ones at

work. Each racial group sought not only independence, but revenge on its neighbors. The temporary weakness of Russia and the dissolution of the Turkish Empire gave them their chance. Not merely Armenians, but Georgians and Tartars, set up independent governments. The Greeks took Smyrna to the accompaniment of hideous atrocities and manifested a great desire for the Hinterland. But Turkish nationalism speedily revived and Mustapha Kemal proved himself a competent leader. After a time the Soviet government became well enough established to reassert some power and more influence in the territories once belonging to Russia. Neither Georgians, Armenians, nor Tartars really love the Russians any more than they love each other; but among all these groups Bolshevik agitation against the western powers has its effect, and the Tartars and Georgians apparently have arrived at a pretty satisfactory understanding with the Russians which will give Russia access to needed supplies of oil. Common interests as against European capitalistic imperialism have, moreover, made for good understanding between Turkish nationalists (whose communist philosophy is at least open to doubt) and Soviet Russia. Under these circumstances, neither the western imperialists nor the Greek chauvinists have an altogether easy time. Sir William Ramsay, the great English archaeologist and student in Asia Minor, has made the interesting charge that Venizelos and Mustapha Kemal reached an agreement whereby the Turks only put up a perfunctory resistance to the Greek advance back of Smyrna. Venizelos achieved his glory at an easy price. In return, Kemal was left free to use his forces to recover Cilicia from the French and consolidate his power against Armenia. Sir William Ramsay's opinion carried weight not merely because of his own intimate knowledge of the country, but because in view of the strength of the Turkish nationalists it seems impossible that the Greeks could have won such easy victories had opposition been strong.

Meanwhile, that astute politician, Venizelos, was finding that his dream of greater Greece had its drawbacks. Whatever temporary agreement he may have made with the Turkish nationalists, it must have been evident to a man of his shrewdness that their growing strength would sooner or later challenge Greek control in Smyrna. The Bulgarians also, who are recuperating their strength, may not rest content in being shut off by Greek expansion from the Aegean, in territory where there is a large Bulgarian population. At home, the Greek people were becoming extraordinarily restive; they were weary of paying the price of war and glory in heavy taxes, the curtailment of their liberties and the lives of their sons. Hence Venizelos' defeat, which he might have prevented. Greece was under virtual martial law, and the

troops were under Venizelos' control. There is no Australian ballot in Greece. Men vote by casting a marble into an urn. One urn is marked for and one against the government. Some sort of secrecy is assured to the voter by providing that the urn shall be kept behind a partition. The voter thrusts his hand in a tube, but a skillful observer can easily tell which way he turns it. It is quite possible for any government under martial law to bring up plenty of floaters to carry an election. Venizelos' defeat, therefore, in the opinion of Captain Paxton Hibben, perhaps the best informed American on conditions throughout all this region, was due to his own shrewd realization that sooner or later some Greek government would have to pay the piper, that Greece was likely to shrink rather than increase in size. He preferred to get out from under in time. Now Venizelos was a great protégé of the Allies. His defeat is therefore a blow to their plans. Combine with this defeat the collapse of Wrangel, the growing strength of the Turkish nationalist movement, the sympathetic protest not only of the Indian Moslems but of the Hindus against the terms of the Turkish treaty, Arab opposition to French rule in Syria, and rebellion against British rule in Mesopotamia, and it is apparent how serious a check Allied intrigue has received in the Near East. The tragedy of it all is that behind this tale of intrigue—French, British, Italian, Turkish, Russian, Armenian, Tartar, Georgian, Greek, Syrian, Arab—is the suffering of the peasant population of all these countries who are taken from the plow and from all constructive tasks for unending warfare. The great need of the Near East is peace, but the first requisite for peace is the substitution of some constructive policy of harmonizing races in Asia Minor and the abandonment of the exploitation of countries and peoples not for their own benefit, but for the greater power and glory of western concession holders. There is no easy road to this solution. It is idle to say that it would be solved were America to take a mandate over a narrowly limited Armenia. It is doubtful if America could solve it even had she a wider mandate unless she first exorcised the spirit of imperialism at home. Let Haiti bear witness!

Early in 1919 it would have been comparatively easy to give security to Armenia. A properly organized league of nations free from imperialism might do something even now, but it is difficult to hope much from the present League. Most of the Assembly probably sympathize with Armenia, but real power lies in the Council. Remembering the French record, M. Viviani's tears are a bit on the crocodile order, and there is danger that Armenia will again be a pawn in Franco-British rivalry. Some nation may intervene (i. e., bargain) with Mustapha Kemal Pasha; no power will for disinterested motives put 60,000 men in the field against

him. Russian influence is speculative. Asia is surely not ripe for industrial communism. Some observers think Russia's eastern policy more likely to easternize her than to westernize the East. At any rate, her aggressive policy may be modified. Lenin has promised to abstain from anti-British

propaganda for the sake of trade. Nevertheless, it is not likely that Russia will be without influence in Asia Minor, and the effect of her influence will probably be to mitigate religious and tribal hates. The only real hope is in a process of education, and to this Americans can effectively contribute.*

Political Crime in Europe

By ROBERT FERRARI

THE subject of political crime is at the moment vital but confused in this country. We have hundreds of political prisoners and convicts, but they are not recognized as such by our government or by our laws. The European view of political crime, which is the result of centuries of struggle between people and government, is therefore particularly worthy of study here at this time.

A description of the French law of political crime will stand as typical of the continent of Europe.

ORIGINAL DOCTRINE OF POLITICAL CRIME.—Political crimes are those against the political organization and against the powers of State.* They are of three kinds: pure, mixed and connected. "A political crime is that which has not only as predominant characteristic, but draws along with it as exclusive and single consequence, the destruction, modification, or the troubling of the political order in one or more of its elements."† Some speech and press offenses (that is, those directed at overturning the government by speaking or printing) are good examples of pure political crimes. Public discussions of public questions are purely political. Crimes which offend only public law and interest are political; crimes which violate individual interests are common or ordinary crimes. A mixed or connected political crime violates both public and individual interests. The motive is political, but the act committed comes within the prohibition of the ordinary penal law. The attempt to change the forms of government without force and violence is pure political crime; the attempt to change it by killing the head of the State is mixed political crime; the attempt to overturn it which entails, for example, the pillaging of a gun shop is connected political crime. In the last case, the crime injures the individual (the shopkeeper), but it is committed with a political motive.

There are two extreme views as to the mixed and connected political crimes. The subjective view looks only to the motive, and judges the act by that motive. The political motive, therefore, changes the character of a common crime, as murder, to a political crime. The objective view looks only to

the act. If the act is a common crime, then the political motive cannot affect the character of the act.‡

The subjective view has not been accepted by any government. The objective view, in a modified form, has been adopted. The act is considered a crime by the ordinary penal law; but this act is affected by the motive, the end, the occasion, and punishment is accordingly mitigated. The political intention or motive, then, is an extenuating circumstance. The doctrine of extenuating circumstances in sentencing convicts of common crime is strange to American ears. American judges apply extenuating circumstances in sentencing convicts of common crime. On the continent of Europe, when the jury brings in a verdict of guilty with extenuating circumstances it is not a recommendation the jury makes to the judge, but a determination which is binding upon the Court, and the Court must act as is indicated in the Penal Code. But in spite of this objective view, in time of insurrection and civil war even common crimes may be political. If the acts are lawful according to the international law of warfare, the crimes are political. If the acts are condemned by the law of nations even in a state of regular war, the crimes come within the ordinary penal law.§

EXTENSION OF THE CONCEPT AND DOCTRINE OF POLITICAL CRIME.—Political crimes now take a wider sweep than they did formerly. They include crimes against the economic and social organization,¶ The tendency in Europe is to extend the doctrine of political crime to industrial and labor crimes. A labor leader arrested not for an ordinary crime committed during a strike, but for a purely labor crime, as calling out the membership in a vital industry at a critical period of war or peace, is treated as a political prisoner. And just as the motive in the strictly political crime is considered in extenuation of the crime, so in the industrial warfare of modern times between those who have and those who have not the larger motive of the general good, rather

*No constructive agencies have played so hopeful a role as the American agencies, Roberts College in Constantinople and the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut.

†Garrand, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

‡Garrand, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

§De Luca, *op. cit.*, vol. II., p. 292.

*De Luca, *Principii di Criminologia*, vol. II., p. 230.

†Garrand, *Précis de droit criminel*, 11th edition, Paris, 1912, pp. 88 ff.

than the particular welfare, dominates and impresses upon the character of the crime the quality of artificiality rather than of naturalness. In addition, the stress is nowadays upon the industrial and not upon the political. It is not so much the form of government people want to see changed as it is the form of industry upon which their lives depend. Crime, therefore, is no longer solely or largely directed against the forms of government, but against the forms of industrial and economic conditions. Those speech and press crimes* which are not political under the original doctrine of political crime come under this extension.

THE REASON FOR LENIENCY IN POLITICAL CRIMES.—"Political crimes are to a less extent directed against the very bases of social life than they are against the established order. They have not then the same immorality as the common crimes. A rational legislation will repress these two classes of crimes by different penalties, because political criminality is of an entirely distinct nature from that of ordinary criminality."[†]

Crimes are *mala in se* and *mala prohibita*. *Mala in se* are crimes even without statutory recognition. *Mala prohibita* are not inherently tainted with turpitude, but are made criminal by society as social, industrial, and political conditions change. Murder, robbery, burglary are *mala in se*. Leaving an ash can uncovered is *malum prohibitum*. The *mala in se* are natural crimes; the *mala prohibita* artificial. Political crimes are not natural crimes; they are not crimes which are the same even in civilizations of approximate character. They differ with time and place. They are dependent upon transitory political conditions. "The political criminal is today considered as a friend of the public good, as a man of progress, desirous of bettering the political institutions of his country, having laudable intentions, hastening the onward march of humanity, his only fault being that he wishes to go too fast, and that he employs in attempting to realize the progress which he desires, means irregular, illegal, and violent."[‡] (Note that in almost every single case in this country in the prosecutions under the Espionage Act and the Criminal Syndicalism and Criminal Anarchy laws there has been no violence to person or property; and the acts committed for which large numbers of individuals have been sentenced to long terms of harsh imprisonment are what among Europeans are known as speech and press offenses—discussions of public questions in a public manner by speech or by writing without the admixture of violence to person or property.) "The political criminal is often inspired by noble sentiments, by disinterested motives, by devotion to persons and prin-

ciples, by love of his country. His criminality is often passing. The author of a political crime who is rather a vanquished, a *conquered man*, than a criminal, may become, as a result of a revolution favorable to his ideas, the *conqueror* of the morrow, who is called regularly and lawfully to direct and guide the state, and the public administration of the country. The penal reaction exercised against him is not at all, then, like that exercised against ordinary malefactors, who violate the ordinary law, in which case it is a work of *social defense* against an attack upon the immanent conditions of human existence, but is rather a work of the *defense of caste*, of *political parties*, against an attack upon an organization and upon a political régime historically transitory."[§]

In international law "the distinction between political and ordinary crimes is now recognized both specially in treaties and generally in diplomatic practice. Those conversant with history cannot fail to have observed that sometimes men noble and venerated have assailed the political constitution of their native land. The interests of statesmanship, of justice, and of humanity unite in invoking protection of this kind [asylum] for political fugitives."[¶] Sound statesmanship requires that we make the distinction between political and common crime in our domestic affairs.

Once it is established that an act is a political crime, certain consequences flow from it. These consequences pertain to the penalty, to the trial of the prisoner, to extradition, and to amnesty.

PENALTIES.—The penalties for political crime in Europe are lighter than they are among us. Sentences to ten years in prison are unheard of. France abolished the penalty of death for political crimes in 1848, but in 1893 and 1894 it reestablished the penalty for certain forms of political crimes, not anti-caste or anti-governmental, it was held, but anti-social and anti-human.

The prison treatment is milder than it is among us: (1) Political convicts enjoy the privileges of prisoners awaiting trial for common crime. (2.) They are not submitted to the ordinary penitentiary régime. (3.) They are not measured anthropologically or finger-printed. (4.) They are not forced to work. (5.) They may take their food in the mess hall or get it from outside the prison. (6.) They wear civilian clothes and retain their hair and beard uncut. (7.) They may receive daily visits in the reception room, and even in their cells or their rooms. (8.) They are separated from those convicted of common crimes. (9.) They may live in common with other political criminals. (10.) They may visit one another, even in those prisons which have the cellular system. (11.) They can

*See discussion of seditious words and writings under heading, "England."

†Garraud, op. cit., pp. 88 ff.

M

‡Vidal, *Contra de Droit criminel et de Science pénitentiaire*, Paris, 1916, p. 111.

§Vidal, op. cit., pp. 111-112.

¶Farnelle's *Wharfen's Conflict of Laws*, 3rd ed., pp. 1688-1690, note 3.

never be declared habitual criminals for convictions of political offenses.*

TRIAL BY JURY.—By the Constitutions of 1830 and 1848 of France political felonies and misdemeanors were to be judged by the Cour d'Assises,—a court with a jury,—and the jury was to have absolute right to decide the law and the facts.† Various changes have since been made; but according to the law of July 29, 1881, most political crimes are tried by a jury; and this applies particularly to speech and press offenses—oral and written discussions upon public matters. The prisoner has the right to present his evidence uninterrupted by anyone. After his full and unshackled presentation, he may be questioned. The political prisoner, however, undergoes cross-examination, as do all other prisoners, at the hands of the Court on the threshold of the trial, before any evidence on the part of the prosecution or the defense has been adduced. But this is welcomed by the political prisoner, since it gives him an opportunity fully to explain his ideas, his ideals, and his motives—a thing it is impossible to do in our American Courts because of the hampering rules of evidence. The prisoner, personally or by counsel, has the right, in addition, to speak to the jury the last word in the case. The judge delivers no charge to the jury, in order that the jury may be free to decide uninfluenced both upon the law and upon the facts.

EXTRADITION.—The first treaty agreement on the subject of extradition was made between France and Belgium March 22, 1856. There was to be no extradition for pure political crime and for some complex political crimes. The general practice of nations sanctioned by the International Institute at its session of 1892 at Geneva makes extraditable grave complex political crime like murder, mutilation, serious woundings; attempts to commit these crimes; attacks on property by burning, explosion, inundation; and serious larcenies, especially those committed with violence. Acts committed during insurrection or civil war, which are allowable by the rules of war, are non-extraditable. Those committed contrary to the rules of war are extraditable, but only after the war or the insurrection has ended.

AMNESTY.—Amnesty for political convicts is granted.‡

ENGLAND.—The liberality of England to Englishmen in regard to speech and even action is well known. The fierce prosecutions at the end of the Eighteenth Century and the stubborn and brilliant defenses, combined with the security of England after the overthrow of the Napoleonic power and the disappearance of the peril to the State from the Continent, produced a tolerance and freedom which all have admired. Though the statutes have penalized the speaking of seditious words, and seditious

libel (the writing of seditious words), the machinery of law has rarely been put into motion during the past half century.

Hard labor is not to be given for speaking seditious words or for seditious libel.*

Those not sentenced to hard labor are divided into three divisions, and those sentenced for sedition or seditious libel are put into the first division, in which the best treatment is given.†

"By the Prison Act, 1877 (40 and 41 Vict. c. 21, s. 40), the Prison Commissioners shall see that any prisoner under sentence inflicted upon conviction of sedition or seditious libel shall be treated as a misdemeanant of the first division within the meaning of Sec. 67 of the Prison Act, 1865 (28 and 29 Vict. O. 126), notwithstanding any statute, provision, or rule to the contrary."‡

The crime of speaking or writing seditious words, for which our Espionage Act and our Criminal Anarchy and Criminal Syndicalism laws and our proposed Federal Sedition Act provide atrocious punishments, making felons of political offenders, is in England only a misdemeanor.§

There are few prisoners in the first Division indicating that prosecutions and convictions for political offenses are rare.

The situation in Ireland is abnormal from the English point of view. There is open sedition and rebellion from the standpoint of English law. Yet the application of the law is lenient. Even direct incitement to force and violence and murder is lightly dealt with. The editor of the *Catholic Herald*, published in London, was sentenced "to six months imprisonment in the second division on a charge of inciting to murder."¶

In the numerous trials under the Espionage Act and under the Criminal Syndicalism laws in America there is not even a pretense of direct incitement to violence or murder. The Parliamentary debate in the case of Irishmen in England in April, 1920, elicited a statement from the government that in future ameliorative treatment is to be given from the date of arrest to conviction, and that the prisoners will be treated quite differently from both convicted and untried men.‡‡ Political prisoners in Mountjoy Prison (in Ireland) went on a hunger strike. The authorities "agreed to the release of the prisoners and sanctioned an improvement of the treatment of political cases."§§ If ordinary prisoners went on a hunger strike, release would be granted under any conditions. The present ill-treatment of Irish prisoners is made possible by substituting martial for civil law.

*Russell, *Crimes and Misdemeanors*, 7th ed., p. 212.

†Russell, *op. cit.*, pp. 213, 310.

‡Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

§Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¶Lord French and other persons responsible for the government of Ireland in an article entitled "Killing No Murder," *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, March 12, 1920.

‡‡*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, April 16, 1920, p. 313.

§§*Manchester Guardian Weekly*, April 16, 1920.

*Vidal, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

†Garrand, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

‡Garrand, *Code Penal Annoté*, Art. 1, No. 137.

European Governments have come to realize the necessity of full and frank discussion. In this country we have had during the last three years almost no convictions for what the Europeans call political crime because of acts which have had an admixture of violence to person or property. The acts for which convictions have been had were speech and press offenses, public discussions of public affairs. The question is in this country simplified. We have not to deal with mixed political crime—with common crime (the injury to person and property) combined with a political motive—but only with pure political crime.

It is dangerous to restrict discussion on public affairs. A great American authority says:*

"It is now generally felt that unless criticism be permitted to penetrate even to the foundations of government, revolution rather than reform will result. . . . To prevent the application of revolutionary criticism to government is of all modes of government the most revolutionary. And closely allied with this position is another, that among countries used to freedom [seditious] libels [speech and press attacks on the government] only begin to bring the state into contempt when they are prosecuted by the state as contemptuous."

A Christmas Appeal

THIS Christmas will see widespread hunger throughout the world; even relatively prosperous America will not escape if unemployment continues. But there are certain areas where hunger has become starvation, and privation destitution. Last Christmas our readers generously met our appeal for the children of Austria and Germany. It is not our intention this year to create a fund of our own, but we do not want the Christmas season to pass without calling attention not only to the needs of the world, but to the agencies of relief. Surely the continuance of misery has not dried up the springs of compassion within the hearts of the American people!

The latest famine is reported from China. A population of 25,000,000 is involved, living in North China in an area running 500 miles north and south and from 100 to 200 miles east and west. Already thousands of people have tried to emigrate from this region to Manchuria. The Manchurian authorities have become alarmed and have lined the border with police and troops to exclude the famine refugees. Within the territory affected, extreme drought has reduced crops, never more than barely sufficient for the needs of the population, to from one-tenth to three-tenths of the normal size. The people have no funds to import grain. The Chinese government has shown some concern, but is notoriously inefficient. Thistles and elm leaves are common articles of diet. As so often happens, cholera and other diseases follow in the wake of hunger. People die by the roadsides, parents sell or abandon their children wherever there is food. Our own Red Cross has entered the field and given an appropriation of \$500,000. The *Christian Herald* of New York has a special fund. Any money that is contributed will be wisely expended through missionaries and trained workers.

In the Near East, the need of relief still continues. War and the absolute lack of the simplest kind of agricultural machinery have prevented the

cultivation of the fields. But despite war, the agents of the Near East Relief committee are at work. While the need is particularly great among Armenians, the committee places no racial or creedal limit upon the charity wherewith it seeks to give evidence that the spirit of brotherhood is not wholly dead.

In Europe the year has not seen much progress. Food conditions are worst in Austria. The people in enormous numbers in the beautiful and gracious city of Vienna are literally starving. In Germany, the Americans are feeding about half a million children, and they are only able to minister to the most needy. It is a fortunate circumstance that a magazine of the great circulation of the *Literary Digest* has begun to make public the facts about the misery of Central Europe.

But American public opinion, which has at last come to see the necessity of feeding the hungry children of those who were its enemies, still hardens its heart against Russia. Our Red Cross has rushed aid to every bandit who proclaims himself the savior of Russia. Societies of the rich and powerful profess a desire to aid the starving people of Russia, but they refuse to minister to the needs of any of those within the boundaries of Soviet Russia, and *Russia today is Soviet Russia*. It ought to be a matter of pride and honor for Americans who realize how much responsibility our government bears for the sufferings in Russia by its policy of blockade to bring medical relief and supplies to the needy of that great land. While our government still maintains a virtual blockade against ordinary trade with Russia, it does somewhat grudgingly permit medical and other relief supplies to be shipped. Russia has few medicines: she has food, but lacks transportation facilities and numbers her war refugees by hundreds of thousands. Mr. H. G. Wells has vividly brought be-

*Kerr's Wharton's Criminal Law, 3rd ed., p. 2128.

fore our eyes the picture of the dying city of Petrograd. But neither he nor any writer has been able to make us understand the suffering of the survivors in, and the refugees from, the territories in southwestern Russia over which armies have fought for six years. It happens that this region contains the old Jewish Pale, and large numbers of the sufferers are Jews. Jewish relief agencies therefore have been foremost in bringing relief, but by no means all the sufferers are Jews, nor should all the relief be from Jewish sources. The Soviet Government has made admirable arrangements for fair distribution of relief. A representative of the Moscow public relief committee is in this country with Soviet approval to facilitate shipments of supplies. Fortunately, many committees are beginning to call the attention of Americans to this situation, but we do not think it invidious to

commend the work of the Friends especially. They are working both in Central Europe and in Russia. In every case they have won the good will and the confidence of governments and people. They have learned the art of giving something more precious than daily bread, even food for the spirit of those who have been starved not only in body but in soul by the terrors of war and the rigors of an unjust peace. If the Friends have any fault it is that their modesty has kept them from telling the story of their good deeds. If that story were bound in the dark book of recent history, the pages in which it was written would shine with the glory of light. *May we therefore especially remind our readers that the headquarters of the Friends Service Committee is 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, to which checks may be sent and from which information may be had?*

Open for Discussion

Letters to the Editor on Current Questions

More News from France

LITTLE that is new has taken place since my last letter. The Russo-Polish question, which during the great offensive inflamed public opinion, seems suddenly to have been relegated to a secondary position, though it is far from settled.

The cause is, without doubt, the ministerial realignment resulting from the presidential crisis, which has ended in the election of Millerand. This election has occasioned little enthusiasm throughout the country in spite of the efforts of the nationalistic press. The new president is not, however, unpopular. On the contrary, the country at large is very well satisfied with the policy of force analogous to that of Clemenceau, which is still widely supported in many places. But public opinion has scarcely recovered from the painful impression occasioned by President Deschanel's accident. He has lost his mind and leaves universal regret behind him.

However, in spite of his errors on the Russian question and the latest strikes, Millerand was still, of all the aspirants for the presidency, the most desirable, and his election is preferable to that of a Castellane, the official candidate of the militarists and of the conservatives. Finally, as the power of the president of France is exceedingly limited I feel that the influence of Millerand is less dangerous in the presidency than in the council of ministers.

The socialist party has started on a new path along which I cannot bring myself to follow. It is the revolutionary element that now dominates it, and the official organ of the party, *L'Humanité*, which till now has succeeded in keeping itself impartial, is becoming sectional and violent in an effort to arouse direct action. I cannot believe that the moment has yet come for an attempt at revolution against the government. There are too many ignorant people, and furthermore the immediate difficulties of ordinary life have created a state

of mind that subordinates the public welfare to private advantage. How would it be possible to attempt action under these conditions? The great lack is that of a common ideal, of solidarity, of comprehension, and of a sincere faith. It was this that caused the failure of the attempt at the nationalization of the railroads and which, it seems to me, precipitated matters in a direction actually contrary to the welfare of the people.

Our economic position remains very unsatisfactory. The rate of exchange is still very low, and in spite of the efforts of big business, we are still importing much more than we export, and there is a never-ending rise in the price of living. We are still suffering from the unproductiveness of the devastated regions, of which the restoration progresses but slowly as a result of the enormous cost which this restoration lays on the country, which is deprived of the products of the chief industrial centers.

LOUISE MARTIN.

Lisieux, France.

Dr. Dole's "Small Bonus"

DR. DOLE'S allusion to interest as a "small bonus" would appear in its true light if appended to the report of the fabulous dividends distributed by the favored banks of the country. Has Dr. Dole ever looked at a table of compound interest? Does he not know that imperial policy in ancient Rome was dictated by the fact that every Roman statesman, from Caesar down, was in debt to the money lenders? Does not history reveal that only bankruptcy or revolution can relieve the congestion produced by that power which as Bacon said "bringeth the treasury of a realm into a few hands?"

Charles A. Dana wrote: "A country which pays even 5 per cent. interest, to say nothing of the rates

of Wall Street, must from time to time commit bankruptcy, in order to rid itself of a burden of debts which it cannot discharge, its entire property having already passed into the hands of the creditors. This fact has not hitherto received the attention its merits, only because the creditors are in most cases within the country itself." Ramsay McDonald says: "The power of the financier is that by which Labor Parties and Labor Governments are likely to be brought to grief." Private letters from England state that Mr. Philip Snowden and, let us hope, Mr. McDonald also, is studying the question of credit. Hilaire Belloc wrote: "In all parliamentary countries a few intriguers are the unworthy depositories of power, and by their service of finance permit the money dealers to govern us today." Yet deprived of its interest-taking power, money is the greatest of inventions, the greatest of blessings.

Dr. Dole ought to be aware of the fact that interest as paid today is due to the violation of the law of equal freedom. It is a gross violation of this law that certain banks should be able to obtain currency from the government free of interest and dispense it at 6 per cent. to the national bank, who of course must charge the business world more to make expenses. If this country were by, of and for the people and not by, of and for the monopoly grasps there would be no reason why business men should not be able to obtain currency on the same conditions, namely, in exchange for adequate and fully insured security, at a cost covering nothing but insurance and cost of production. This would probably amount to less than 1 per cent. a year.

JOHN BASIL BARNHILL,
Xenia, Illinois. Editor of *Humanity First*.

Chinese Politics

WHEN the military party forced Li Yuen Hung out of the presidency the southwest revolted, pretending to be all for the Constitution and the legal president and parliament. As a matter of fact, both sections of the country were absolutely under the control of the military party and there was little to choose between them. The generals, especially the *tuchuns*, or military governors, ruled all with a high hand and without any reference to the rights of the people.

In the north the Anfu party gradually gained control, and the leaders got rich through squeezes which might have been tolerated, and through Japanese loans which were not. Finally the Chihli party, which had lost control, rose up in the person of three men, Chang Tso Lin, *tuchun* of Mukden, Ts'ao Knn, *tuchun* of Chihli, and Wu Pei Fu, who had retired from the command of the army opposing the south in Hunan, and brought his army with him. Chang was a robber chief until he became an official, which he has found much more profitable. Ts'ao is a little better. Wu is an able officer and as Chinese officials go an honest and patriotic man. He did nearly all of the fighting which put the Anfu party out and has gotten very little of the power. He is anxious to call a national constitutional assembly, but the other two think "the time is not ripe," i. e., that they can make more by ruling themselves. The president does what they tell him to, as he did for the Anfu party when they were in power.

It is just within the range of possibility that Wu's plan for a constitutional assembly, which has strong popular support, may be forced through, but if it is Chang and Ts'ao will probably succeed in making it void. The one good which seems at all probable to accrue to the country is that the southwest may possibly be reconciled, though even that is by no means certain.

I saw a cartoon in a Shanghai Chinese paper the other day which expresses the situation well. It was called "Driving the tiger from the door, the wolves come in at the back." The picture was of a man with a spear driving a tiger from the front of a building labeled "Government," while two wolves were coming in at the back, and the two wolves were labeled Chang and Ts'ao.

D. H.

"Corners"

I WOULD not undervalue corners as places for recuperation and many other good things. But I must protest against the idea that all pacifists regard their experience primarily as a tragedy, driving them into corners, with no hope of anything better than being "as happy as they can ever be again anywhere." Some, who have been or become pacifists during these years just past, would say that, if they have known more terrible suffering than ever before, yet, amidst all the grief and horror and wickedness, they have begun to see the Christian faith—which they already counted the best and most beautiful thing in life—unfolding and revealing itself as grander, stronger, more gloriously perfect than anything they ever imagined; and they have gained such an assurance as they had never before felt of being *really* united with the mightiest power in the universe, which must inevitably conquer at last, whatever may befall in the meanwhile and however that meanwhile may be protracted.

They can say, as one of the English conscientious objectors said in prison: "As I look back over the last three years, I do not regret for myself personally anything that has happened to me. . . . I have been happier, I think, have lived and grown more during this period than during any other of my life. . . . For what I have suffered, I have obtained a very great recompense indeed."

Providence, R. I.

A PACIFIST.

Who never has beheld the fields grow green
From behind prison bars,
Nor from a narrow cell at twilight seen
The dear forbidden stars
Glisten above the shadow of a wall
Where Death stands guard,
Nor ever heard the dreadful hammers fall
On a new scaffold-board—

Who never has from joy been shut away,
By the proud world forgot,
And waited, hour by hour, and day by day,
With human souls that rot
Under the lash of heartless tyranny
Where Life has nought to give
Save tears,—he knows not what it means to die,—
Nor what it means to live!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Ex Libris

Three Books on Economics

The Acquisitive Society. By R. H. Tawney (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

Economic Democracy. By C. H. Douglas (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

Profits, Wages and Prices. By David Friday (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).

MR TAWNEY, who is a fellow at Oxford and a late member of British Coal Industrial Commission, starts his book on the "Acquisitive Society" by describing the characteristic virtue of Englishmen as "their power of sustained practical activity," and their characteristic vice, the reluctance to test that activity by reference to principles. "They are incurious as to theory, take fundamentals for granted, and are more interested in the state of the roads than in their place on the map." Within five pages, Mr. Tawney has proved that he is an Englishman. He makes no attempt to define "acquisitiveness" and does not devote himself to the theory of "Acquisitive Society" at all. He is interested in certain of its forms—property, militarism, labor efficiency, etc. Where he does appeal to theory, it is to the dry and discarded *laissez-faire* theory of the Eighteenth Century. He writes his book as though the Russian Constitution had never appeared and with the Englishman's customary assumption of superior validity and practical experience.

C. H. Douglas qualifies. Under Tawney's definition, he, too, is English.

The visitor to the British Isles nowadays is very likely to be asked "Have you seen Major Douglas? Do you accept his theory?"

Major Douglas's theory has now invaded the United States. Major Douglas proposes to set up an economic state with power to enforce its decrees, but built upon voluntary cooperation. He is an engineer applying his experience with physical science in the field of Sociology, and with the engineer's customary lack of appreciation of the difficulties involved in moulding human institutions. Major Douglas does not seem to appreciate the fact that nerve tissue, while soft and yielding to the touch, is far more impervious to modifying ideas and experiences than is the hardest nickel-steel.

Major Douglas cannot apply his theory unless he wins the support of the worker, and he has propounded no method for winning the British Trade Unionist to the acceptance of his somewhat naive economic assumptions.

Those who believe in facts are not exclusively English. Whatever Mr. Friday's ancestry, he is certainly more concerned over the state of the roads than over their position on the map. Beginning with an admirable statement of profits, industrial surpluses and wages during the years since 1914, he goes to an analysis of the method of solving the difficult economic situation which he has described. "The experiences of the last five years reveal pretty clearly two fundamental facts," he writes. "The first of these is that

we have such a reserve of productive capacity in this country that the possibility of raising the real wages of labor to the point where the means of well-being shall be realized for all classes, remains no longer a mere dream. It has become a possibility." The second lesson is that the mere raising of money wages is not adequate to effect the desired increase in real wages.

Therefore, says Prof. Friday, we must increase productivity. He does not show how the increase in productivity would take the form of real wages, nor does he seek to answer the question, How can you increase productivity unless you can discover adequate markets for the disposal of the increased surplus? As an analyst of the recent changes in profits and wages, Prof. Friday qualifies among the best; but his prescriptions for the disastrous economic situation which he uncovers are feeble and ineffective.

SCOTT NEARING.

Sound Workmanship

THE "blurb" on the jacket setting forth that this is "by far the most distinguished and most significant first novel by an American" that has ever been offered to the publisher is not without justification. *Moon-Calf*. By Floyd Dell (Alfred A. Knopf). *Moon-Calf* has a long-drawn mellowness that is not usually associated with first novels, and a warm human quality that is too seldom inherent in the fiction of professional propagandists. Knowing that Floyd Dell is Managing Editor of *The Liberator*, you might suspect that a novel from his pen would be primarily a defense of socialism and its implications, with an admixture of Freudian psychology; and you would be mistaken. Instead, it is the story of a young man who is indeed a socialist, but first, like the rest of us, a human being, and a delightful human being. It is his story from boyhood to young manhood, with no little of the delight of the thing concentrated in the boyhood part. It is the story of a dreamer, an intellectualist, an Idealist: his struggles to adapt himself to life, his friendships and loves, his failures and egotisms, the growth of his thoughts: such a one, indeed, as you and I have met many times and always liked uncommonly well. In fact, Mr. Dell has written a book that is as welcome as friends and a fireside on a winter's night.

G. H.

A Study in Starvation

Hunger. By Knut Hamsun (Alfred A. Knopf).

IF this first volume of Knut Hamsun's to be published in America is any criterion of the quality of his other books, we may await their appearance with no little eagerness; and Mr. Knopf may be congratulated on adding Hamsun's name to his list, quite aside from the fact that Hamsun has just been awarded the Nobel Prize. *Hunger* is a singular novel. It is concerned from first to last with the emotions, sensations, dreams, hallucinations, actions, of a man who comes perilously near starving to death in a modern

city: a man who is an inerrigible dreamer and who cannot get a job. The sustained tensidy of the thing is terrible in its effectiveness, though a certain humor of psychological observation relieves it of pure horror. The book misses its concentration on a single theme about as little as a trip-hammer misses a rivet. It calls to mind, somehow, De Quincey's *Opium Eater*, with starvation substituted for laudanum; and for the reader who has followed the case of the Irish hunger strikers, it has an added poignancy. It is, in a word, masterly.

G. H.

More Talks by Lafcadio Hearn

Talks to Writers. By Lafcadio Hearn (Dodd, Mead & Co.).

SOMETHING of quietness and contemplation is here that brings relief to the reader jaded by too many books, too many movements, too much of the nervous hurry of today. The book, indeed, takes you back to college lecture halls, and that leisurely thought which is the greatest boon of college. It is a pleasure to be told, even if you know you will never live up to the advice, that the only books worth reading at all are those that we will read three or four or a dozen times, finding new delights at each reading; and to hear talk again of such enduring masterpieces as the Norse sagas and the essays of Sir Thomas Browne. There is sound and quiet advice here for him who writes or would write: advice that is far and away more fundamental and valuable than that to be found in the score of modern correspondence-school volumes on magazine writing: albeit the book is not without archaic Victorianisms of thought. Professor John Erskine, who edits these lectures to Hearn's Japanese students, contributes an illuminating analysis by way of introduction.

J. D.

Potterism

Potterism. By Rose Macaulay (Boni & Liveright).

"POTTERISM" is that combination of sentimentality, muddleheadedness, and greed, characteristic of our times, peculiarly typified in the person of the owner of the Potter Press and his wife, Leila Yorke, the popular novelist. Against Potterism the book is a protest. It is dedicated "to the unsentimental precisians in thought, who have, on this confused, inaccurate and emotional planet, no fit habitation."

Yet a book with this dedication has an amazing popularity and an astonishing "good press." What does that fact prove? Merely that each muddleheaded Potterite sees not himself but his neighbor pitilessly revealed and chuckles as he says "that's Bill—or Susan—to the life"? Or that the author herself does not wholly escape a touch of the disease that makes the whole work kin? One suspects the latter. With all her implied praise of precision of thought and blame of the "clever" writer, Miss Macaulay is nothing if not clever. She is as up-to-date as a newspaper in her use of material, and employs melodrama in the style of a popular novel in order to manipulate her story—witness the death of Oliver and the final end of her hero. Into the mouth of that same hero she puts large and—dare we suggest?—rather Potteristic generalizations

about Russia. Above all, she avoids any real attack on the pocketbook nerve of her readers. Has not every capitalist reviewer quoted with unctious and approval Gideon's remark, "The sentimentalism of Bob Smillie is as bad as the sentimentalism of the Pinkerton press, as untruthful, as greedy, as muddleheaded. Smillie's lot are out to get and the Potterites out to keep." This apropos of Smillie's brilliant handling of the miners' case before the coal commission! Surely it is a kind of super-Potterism which sees so little difference between Smillie's attack on private ownership of coal and the Duke of Northumberland's defense of the old order. In short, the book reveals far more of the cleverness of the rather good humored cynic than the passion of the truth seeker. Perhaps Miss Macaulay's disillusioned outlook on the men and events of our time is the beginning of wisdom. It is a long way from the end.

N. T.

The Readers' Club

THE following books, which appeared during the summer, are recommended for reading:

POETRY

Enslaved and Other Poems—John Masefield.
October and Other Poems—Robert Bridges.
The Elfin Artist and Other Poems—Alfred Noyes.
Modern British Poetry—Louis Untermeyer.

THE WAR

Liluli: A Drama—Romain Rolland.
The Human Costs of the War—Homer Fooks.
Our Great War and the War of the Ancient Greeks—Gilbert Murray.

FICTION

The Rescue—Joseph Conrad.
Miss Lulu Bett—Zona Gale.
INDUSTRY, POLITICS, ETC.

The Advancing Hour—Norman Hapgood.
America and the New Era—Elisha M. Friedman.
What the Workers Want—Arthur Gleason.
Chaos and Order in Industry—G. D. H. Cole.
The Steel Strike—William Z. Foster.
The Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike.
The Story of the Non-Partisan League

—Charles Edward Russell.

The Negro Faces America—Herbert Seligman.
This Simian World—Clarence Day, Jr.

PHILOSOPHY

Mind Energy—Henri Bergson.
Outlines of Psychoanalysis—Sigmund Freud.
Religion and the New Psychology

—Walter S. Swisher.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

IN selecting books for Christmas presents for children, readers of THE WORLD TOMORROW may be glad to know of the following, which seem to me to express, in some degree at least, the spirit of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, which is, after all, the spirit of Christmas:

This Way to Christmas. Ruth Sawyer (Harper).
Kissington Town. Abbie Farwell Brown (Houghton Mifflin).

The Kingdom of the Winding Road. Cornelia Meigs (MacMillan).

Once-Upon-a-Time Tales. Mary Stewart (Revell).
Stories Told to Children. Michael Fairless (Stokes).
The Children's Story Garden. (Lippincott).
Bluebirds' Garden. Fatten Beard (Pilgrim Press).
ANNA COPE EVANS.

The Last Page

SO now General Wrangel is numbered among the dead—well, he had a good run for his money—if it was his money—while it lasted, and for several weeks he managed to achieve quite a prominent place in the headlines of the New York Times. But now he, too, like those other Generals Denikin, Yudenitch, and Kolchak, has strutted off the stage of the world and will trouble us no more. But of course before long the Tsarist clique in Paris will discover a new "saviour" for Russia, and we may expect to see several weeks of such headlines as the following in our favorite newspaper:

Monday—Great anti-Red rising in the Urals—Gen-Popoff leads Siberian army against Soviet Government—Paris reports Red leaders in open break—Trotzky accuses Lenin of kleptomania.

Tuesday—Red Army flees in disorder as General Popoff crosses frontier—President Millerand recognizes Popoff—Lloyd George scarcely recognizes Millerand—President Wilson does not recognize anybody—Berlin wireless states Lenin shoots Trotzky in the Kremlin.

Wednesday—General Foch leaves Paris by aeroplane to advise Popoff, who gains great anti-Red victory, capturing whole of Siberia and 500,000 prisoners—Polish fleet bombards Nijni-Novgorod—Lloyd George scores Red rule in speech in Commons. "Britain cannot trade with murderers," he says—Washington learns of great bomb explosion in Moscow, Lenin and Trotzky missing.

Thursday—General Popoff arrives within 1000 miles of Moscow—Panic in Red capital—Samovars in rebellion seize Red guards and enter Kremlin—Trotzky elopes with Mrs. Lenin, London hears—President-elect Harding tells Daughters of the Revolution that he will never desert Russia.

Friday—General Popoff changes his plan of campaign. Decides to attack Vladivostok before marching on Moscow—Helsingfors report states Trotzky dying of scarlet fever caught while leading Red army—Mr. Colby tells head of American Legion that Lenin is a paid tool of ex-Kaiser.

Saturday—General Popoff is drowned in the Red Sea—His army escapes in a Ford car—Millerand looking for somebody to recognize—Lloyd George tells London bankers business is business—President Wilson receives Ambassador Bakhtmetieff—Lenin reported dying in Moscow of cerebro-jeningitis.

And so on *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam*.

I HAVE just been reading Professor Joly's *Reminiscences and Anticipation*. What delightful gossip and story-tellers the Irish are. It must be Irish blood that justifies the American reputation for good story-telling. In this new volume of his Professor Joly rambles pleasantly about all sorts of things and tells, among others, the following excellent story: A certain local celebrity of Galway while out on a fishing expedition was seized with a fatal heart attack and died while in the act of hooking a large fish. The local paper the next day, in describing the melancholy event,

of his admirable qualities as a husband, father, and citizen. The obituary concludes with these words: "We are sure that our readers will be glad to learn that our respected fellow citizen, Mr. Cornelius O'Flaherty, who happened to be an eye-witness of the sad occurrence, with great presence of mind seized hold of the rod, to which the fish was still attached, and after an exciting struggle succeeded in landing a splendid salmon of 15 pounds weight."

ALL this pomp and circumstances that have been lavished so generously lately in London and Paris upon the poor bruised and brokeu bodies of two unknown conscripts—to whom life today with all its pain would have been a sweeter thing than all these high honors and ceremonials—reminds me of the fine talk of the recruiting sergeant in the Maypole Inn in *Barnaby Rudge*. There stands the coaxing fellow with a little crowd of yokels around him listening open-mouthed as he tells of the joys of a soldier's life—a chance to see the world—fine clothes—sweethearts everywhere—and if there's any fighting to be done always a triumphant return after great victories. "But suppose you should be killed, sir?" says one of the lads. "Well," says the sergeant indignantly, "suppose you are killed. Your country loves you. His Majesty King George III loves you. And your name is written down, in full, in a book in the War Office." In addition to all that the modern recruiting sergeant may now boast that a dead soldier has a million to one chance of being buried in Westminster Abbey.

HERE are some of the noblest and kindest words that ever blotted paper. They occur in the message of reconciliation and good will which fifty-seven professors and doctors of the University of Oxford sent recently to the members of the universities and learned societies in Germany and Austria: "We now personally approach you," write the signatories, "with the desire to dispel the embitterment of animosities that, under the impulse of loyal patriotism, may have passed between us. In the field where our aims are one, our enthusiasms the same, our rivalry and ambition generous, we can surely look to be reconciled; and the fellowship of learning offers a road which may—and if our spiritual ideals be alive, must—lead to a wider sympathy and better understanding between our kindred nations. While political discussions are threatening to extinguish the honorable comity of the European states we pray that we may help to hasten that amicable reunion which civilization demands." It is an open secret that these generous words were chosen and the whole message penned by Dr. Bridge, the Poet Laureate. And now will not our American men of science and learning follow the lead of their English colleagues?

THE WAYFARER.

Two Christmas Gifts In One

YOUR CHRISTMAS MESSAGE is pleasantly renewed each month if you send as a Christmas gift a year's subscription to

THE WORLD TOMORROW
\$1.50 a year; Canada & Foreign, \$1.75.

And it is a gift twice made—a gift not only to the recipient of the magazine but to us as well.

Or, better still, you might read **THE WORLD TOMORROW** and another magazine. We can offer you the following savings on such combinations, and if you like will send each subscription to a different address:

Combination Offers

THE WORLD TOMORROW and

The Freeman.....	\$4.50	Saving \$1.00
The Liberator.....	3.00	" 1.00
The Nation.....	3.25	" 1.25
The New Republic.....	3.50	" 1.00
The Survey.....	3.50	" 1.20
Young India.....	3.25	" .75

BOOKS, too, make Christmas gifts of singular appropriateness, accurately reflecting personalities and interests. You can order through us any book of any publisher—and again you have the satisfaction of making an indirect Christmas gift to this magazine. We list the books in the next column as suggestions merely because they have been reviewed in the magazine.

In ordering books, please include 8% extra for postage west of Chicago, 5% east. Excess postage will be returned.

Acquisitive Society, R. H. Tawney (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
Economic Democracy, C. H. Douglas (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
Profits, Wages and Prices, David Friday (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00
Meat-Calf, Floyd Dell (Knopf).....	2.50
Hunger, Ernst Haeuser (Knopf).....	2.50
Talks to Writers, Lafcadio Hearn (Dodd, Mead).....	2.00
Potterham, Rose Macaulay (Bon & Liveright).....	2.00
The Great Steel Strike, W. Z. Foster (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.75
The Steel Strike of 1919 (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	1.50
A Guide to Russian Literature, Molokanov J. Ugin (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	3.00
Woman, Magdalena Marx (Thomas Schatz).....	2.00
The Russian, Joseph Conrad (Doubleday, Page & Co.).....	2.00
Leath-erf.....	2.50
Youth and the Bright Medusa, Willa Cather (Alfred A. Knopf).....	1.50
Lull, Romain Rolland (Bon & Liveright).....	2.00
Man or the State, Edited by Waldo R. Browne (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.00
Cutlery Papers, Randolph Bourne (B. W. Huebsch).....	1.50
The Social Problem, Charles A. Ellwood (Macmillan).....	1.75
The New Social Order, Harry F. Ward (Macmillan).....	2.00
Our America, Waldo Frank (Bon & Liveright).....	2.00
The Grail of Life, John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co.).....	2.00
Nationalism in Thought and Action, Harry W. Laidler (Macmillan).....	2.50
The Brass Check, Upton Sinclair.....	.50
Debs: His Authorized Life and Letters, David Karsner (Bon & Liveright).....	1.50
Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children (Scribner).....	2.50
New It Can Be Told, Philip Gibbs (Harper).....	3.00
The Judgment of Peace, A. Lasker (Bon & Liveright).....	1.75
The Letters of Anton Chekhov (Macmillan).....	3.00
The Bishop and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
The Chorus Girl and Other Stories, Chekhov (Macmillan).....	2.00
New Ventures of Faith, Edited by Gilbert A. Heaver (Associated Press).....	.15
The Shadow, Mary White Ovington (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00
National Ideals in the Old Testament, Henry Cadbury (Scribner).....	1.75
Useful Wild Plants, Charles Francis Saunders (McBride).....	3.00
Manrow, Patrick MacGill (McBride).....	2.00
The Unfinished Program of Democracy, Richard Roberts (B. W. Huebsch).....	2.00
What the Workers Want, Arthur Gleanan (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	4.00
Darkwater, W. A. Roberts (Harcourt, Brace & Howe).....	2.00

Two Years After the War: The Vindication of Pacifism!

a new address by

John Haynes Holmes

Minister of the Community Church

Price, 10 cents, including postage.

Other addresses available

The Collapse of Civilization: Can Humanity Be Saved?

Doors To Be Kept Open (a plea for free thought and free speech.)

The Price of Peace: Are We Willing To Pay It?

Does God Know His Own Mind?

All 10 cents each

Address—Secretary, Community Church

61 East 34th Street, New York City

CHRISTMAS CARDS

conveying a message in harmony with the spirit of "The World Tomorrow" and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, with a striking drawing in red and black have been made for us by the well-known artist, Rockwell Kent. They will be sent free of charge with books and magazines ordered as Christmas gifts; and they may be purchased from us by our readers at the following prices:

1 card.....	.05	25 cards.....	1.00
6 cards.....	.35	50 cards.....	2.00
15 cards.....	.90	125 cards.....	5.00
		200 cards.....	6.00

If desired, envelopes to match will be sent with these cards at a cost of 1 cent each.

SCATTERED SEEDS

An illustrated monthly magazine for children, edited by Friends, will make a suitable Christmas present. Published by

FRIEND'S CENTRAL

154 N. 15th St., Philadelphia

75c. per year.

WANTED:

A stenographer and typewriter in a lawyer's office. Interest in work for Negro education and the Society of Friends would be an advantage.

L. HOLLINGSWORTH WOOD

20 Nassau Street, New York City



Stanford University Library
Stanford, California

In order that others may use this book,
please return it as soon as possible, but
not later than the date due.